



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2006

No. 50

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 2, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for 5 minutes.

THE PRICE OF GAS

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Democrat on the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I have been calling for hearings on gas price gouging for over 8 months. For 8 months I have been asking for consideration of my legislation, the Federal Response to Energy Emergencies Act, which is designated to crack down on gas price gouging. For 8 months, Republicans in Congress have stonewalled. When Republicans finally start-

ed to feel the political heat, they put forth shallow imitations of Democratic ideas and returned to their old standby, drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The simple fact is this: as gas prices climb, the majority party has been shamed into doing something, but they still are out of ideas. Our legislation, the Democratic legislation, the FREE Act, the Federal Response to Energy Emergencies, would instruct the Federal Trade Commission to develop a legal definition of gas price gouging, predatory pricing and market manipulation. Most people are shocked to find that there is no Federal law against gas price gouging. Therefore, the Federal Trade Commission has never brought a case to court for gas price gouging. Let me repeat that. Never in the history of the Federal Trade Commission has it brought a case of price gouging to court. Why is this? Because there is no definition of price gouging.

Well, even if the President and congressional Republicans don't know how to define price gouging, consumers know it when they see it. Gas costs 70 cents more a gallon right now than it did at the same time last year. Profits for refineries are up 255 percent between September 2004 and September 2005. Last week, Valero, the Nation's largest refinery company, posted a 60 percent increase in profit in the first quarter alone. That's gouging. And while it happens, unfortunately the majority party turns a blind eye.

In contrast, 125 House Democrats have signed a discharge petition. A discharge petition removes our legislation from the committee of jurisdiction and brings it to the floor for a vote. More and more Members each day are signing their name to the discharge petition. These Members are tired of the Republicans' stonewalling. We want action on a real price gouging bill with teeth, not a watered-down imitation.

Just as we need to address gouging, Congress should also take a look at the

way oil futures are bought and sold. Seventy-five percent of the multibillion-dollar oil futures industry is completely unregulated, without transparency or oversight by the Federal Government or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. This is Enron all over again. Without Federal oversight, there is no way to ensure that speculators are not manipulating the market to drive up the price of oil.

Last week, I introduced the PUMP Act, or the Prevent Unfair Manipulation of Prices Act. This bill would require all traders to play by the same rules, ending the speculation, fear and greed that drives today's oil prices. It has been estimated that by stopping this speculative trading, we could reduce the price of a barrel of oil by as much as \$20 per barrel, providing consumers with immediate relief at the gas pump.

These are the kind of ideas that Democrats are promoting to provide consumers with immediate relief. But, instead, we get the same thing from the majority party: drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and provide big tax breaks to big oil. You don't drill your way to energy independence. Tax breaks for the big oil companies don't result in lower gas prices.

Today's USA Today, the Money section, has an article, States Find It Tough to Prove Gas Prices Illegal. In California, the Attorney General says that in 2006 in the first 4 months of this year, prices have gone up 14 percent, but the difference between what oil companies pay for crude oil and the price at the pump is up 130 percent. If that's not price gouging, I don't know what is. In Arizona, they showed that the profit margins realized by every segment of the oil industry were two or three times greater than normal. Is that price gouging? I think it is. But as Arizona says, the State has no law making price gouging illegal, underscoring, the report says, the need for Federal price gouging legislation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1923

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that Speaker HASTERT would allow us to bring up the FREE Act so we could have a free and full debate on price gouging in this Congress.

Look at this next article: Fuel Costs Ease But Could Climb Higher. Why? Money is flowing into direct or indirect purchases of oil futures as an inflation hedge. That flow sends futures higher, fueling more inflation, and then fueling more money into futures positions as an inflation hedge. That is price gouging. That is market manipulation. That is why we have the PUMP Act.

If we would pass the PUMP Act, bring it to the floor for debate, get it out of committee and put it before the House here, we could lower the price of a barrel of oil by \$20.

[From USA Today]

STATES FIND IT TOUGH TO PROVE GAS PRICES ILLEGAL

(By James R. Healey and Matt Krantz)

Arizona's comprehensive investigation into that state's high fuel prices after Hurricane Katrina concludes that while there was "profiteering" at all levels of the oil industry, nothing illegal took place.

Washington's attorney general's office said in a report last week that its more recent investigation of today's high prices "has not found any evidence so far of illegal activity among gasoline retailers or producers in Washington."

Together, the two reports show that it is hard for authorities to prove consumers are being ripped off even in times of extraordinary price increases.

Attorneys general in at least nine states, responding to outrage by their residents, are investigating whether current high gasoline prices are a result of wrongdoing by the petroleum industry, according to the National Association of Attorneys General.

Arizona's statewide average price is \$3.022, still nearly 11 cents less than the record \$3.131 shortly after Katrina, according to travel club AM's daily survey.

Washington's average \$3.011 Monday set a record for that state.

The attorney general in California, where the statewide average hit a record \$3.251 a gallon Monday, says he will subpoena documents from the state's 21 refineries, including those operated by major oil companies ChevronTexaco, ExxonMobil and ConocoPhillips.

The attorney general's office said state data for 2006 show that crude oil prices have risen 14%, but the difference between what oil companies pay for crude oil and prices at the pump has soared 130%.

Gasoline is made from crude oil, which accounts for roughly 55% of the pump price for gasoline, the U.S. government says.

And Washington Attorney General Rob McKenna, in a statement about his investigation, said, "Gas prices are influenced by the basic laws of supply and demand."

Energy-industry veterans wonder if such probes are misleading.

California's own Energy Commission, for instance, acknowledges in an explanation of fuel prices on its website: "Rumors and charges of collusion among the oil companies have been raised for decades with nothing ever proven."

Charles Swanson, director of Ernst & Young's Energy Center, says, "Politicians can posture all they want, but there's nothing they can do to help."

Some states have made price-gouging cases. Florida sued individual gas stations for overcharging after Katrina.

But Florida, unlike Arizona, has an anti-gouging law. It is in effect only when a state of emergency is declared. Florida was a hurricane target, making an emergency declaration logical.

Arizona's report, unveiled last week, says, "Profit margins realized by every segment of the oil industry were two or three times their normal margins."

But the state has no law making that illegal, underscoring, the report says, the need for a federal price-gouging law.

The Federal Trade Commission is expected to deliver a report by May 22 that will say whether the agency found any price manipulation after Katrina.

[From USA Today, May 2, 2006]

FUEL COSTS EASE BUT COULD CLIMB HIGHER

(By James R. Healey)

Gasoline prices have stopped their spring-loaded daily leaps, but it's too soon to say the worst is over.

The numbers on the pump have declined slightly three consecutive days, to a nationwide average \$2.919 a gallon Monday, according to travel club AAA. It's the first time that's happened since late March. But the March respite totaled just 0.8 of a cent over three days and turned out to be only a hiccup that before prices zipped higher.

AAA warns that might happen again. "A few days of slight declines does not make a trend," spokesman Geoff Sundstrom cautions. "We may continue to see higher prices between now and Memorial Day."

That's the beginning of the warm-weather driving season, when gasoline consumption rises as Americans take more vacations and weekend trips.

A weekly report by the U.S. Energy Information Administration showed a U.S. average Monday identical to AAA's—\$2.919—up a just 0.5 of a cent from a week ago. That's a big slowdown after four weeks of prices jumping an average 10.4 cents a gallon per week.

On one hand, it should be no surprise that prices are easing. U.S. gasoline supplies are ample. U.S. demand is a little soft. Refineries are mostly through with their routine maintenance and are cranking out generous amounts of gasoline.

But prices aren't down as far as they should be under those circumstances, energy veterans say. That's partly because petroleum products have become an investment instead of traders' best guess about the value of crude oil, gasoline and heating oil the next few months.

"Money is flowing into direct or indirect purchases of oil futures as an inflation hedge. That flow sends futures higher, fueling more inflation, and then fueling more money into futures positions as an inflation hedge," says Tom Kloza, senior analyst at the Oil Price Information Service. Oil rose \$1.82 to settle at \$73.70 Monday.

Still, "We can put to rest some of the hyperbole—\$3.50 average for gasoline, or \$4-plus," he says.

Keeping upward pressure on prices:

Hostility toward the U.S. in oil-producers Iran and Venezuela implies shortages at any minute.

Indelible memories of disruptions caused by hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico last year keep petroleum traders jumpy about supplies. That makes them willing to pay more for oil and for the gasoline made from it.

"We're heading into the peak demand season and the potential for refinery outages" from hurricanes, cautions Thomas Bentz, senior energy analyst at BNP Paribas, a big investment bank.

The U.S. Minerals Management Service in its latest report, April 19, said that 22.3% of Gulf oil output still hadn't restarted after

hurricane damage last year. The MMS plans to update that number Wednesday.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Most glorious Lord of life, You alone triumph over death and sin, for You alone are eternal and holy. Prove Your victory in us. Take this nation and make it Your own. With leadership from this body of Congress, raise up a people who are unafraid to look into the face of darkness, and by will, science, and prayer push back the door of death. Strengthen all human frailty that we may continue to fight against evil and become a Nation of hope and a people of virtue. For our soul takes wing by placing our trust in You, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the bill on the calendar.

BETTY DICK RESIDENCE PROTECTION ACT

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 584) to require the Secretary of the Interior to allow the continued occupancy and use of certain land and improvements within Rocky Mountain National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 584

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Betty Dick Residence Protection Act".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to require the Secretary of the Interior to permit the continued occupancy and use of the property described in section 4(b) by Betty Dick for the remainder of her natural life.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AGREEMENT.**—The term "Agreement" means the agreement between the National Park Service and Fred Dick entitled "Settlement Agreement" and dated July 17, 1980.

(2) **MAP.**—The term "map" means the map entitled "RMNP Land Occupancy" and dated September 2005, which identifies approximately 8 acres for the occupancy and use by the tenant.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) **TENANT.**—The term "tenant" means Betty Dick, widow of George Fredrick Dick, who held a 25-year reservation of occupancy and use at a property within the boundaries of Rocky Mountain National Park.

SEC. 4. RIGHT OF OCCUPANCY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall allow the tenant to continue to occupy and use the property described in subsection (b) for the remainder of the natural life of the tenant, subject to the requirements of this Act.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The property referred to in subsection (a) is the land and any improvements to the land within the boundaries of Rocky Mountain National Park identified on the map as "residence" and "occupancy area".

(c) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the occupancy and use of the property identified in subsection (b) by the tenant shall be subject to the same terms and conditions specified in the Agreement.

(2) **PAYMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In exchange for the continued occupancy and use of the property, the tenant shall annually pay to the Secretary an amount equal to $\frac{1}{25}$ of the amount specified in section 3(B) of the Agreement.

(B) **ADVANCE PAYMENT REQUIRED.**—The annual payments required under subparagraph (A) shall be paid in advance by not later than May 1 of each year.

(C) **DISPOSITION.**—Amounts received by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be—

(i) deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States; and

(ii) made available, without further appropriation, to the Rocky Mountain National Park until expended.

(3) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—The public shall have access to both banks of the main channel of the Colorado River.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The right of occupancy and use authorized under this Act—

(1) shall not be extended to any individual other than the tenant; and

(2) shall terminate—

(A) on the death of the tenant;

(B) if the tenant does not make a payment required under subsection (c)(2); or

(C) if the tenant otherwise fails to comply with the terms of this Act.

(e) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) allows the construction of any structure on the property described in subsection (b) not in existence on November 30, 2004; or

(2) applies to the occupancy or use of the property described in subsection (b) by any person other than the tenant.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

NO IS NOT AN ENERGY POLICY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats sure do like to stand on this floor and complain about energy costs, but when push comes to shove, they refuse to do anything about it. In fact, since President Clinton vetoed legislation to open ANWR to drilling in 1995, House Democrats have taken a page out of his book by voting no to energy solutions time and time again.

While House Republicans have proven our commitment to lowering the cost of fuel, House Democrats have opposed many measures to increase the supply of American energy.

A large number of Democrats voted against legislation expanding clean nuclear energy supplies. Democrats voted against legislation that would encourage refinery expansion. They voted against legislation that would ban price gouging, and many voted against legislation that would promote greater conservation.

I cannot for the life of me understand why the Democrats continue to complain about energy when they continue to vote "no" on every responsible proposal that would help us produce more American energy at affordable prices. Voting "no" is not a sound energy policy.

LESS THAN 2 WEEKS UNTIL PRESCRIPTION DRUG SIGN-UP DEADLINE

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, if this House does not act within the next 2 weeks, millions of American seniors will face the egregious and unfair prescription drug tax.

As this calendar shows, May 15 is the deadline President Bush and congressional Republicans created for seniors to sign up for a prescription drug plan. In town hall meetings I have held throughout my district, the seniors of Missouri District 5 are outraged by and confused over Medicare part D. If they do not sign up for a plan within the next 13 days, a penalty of at least a 7 percent premium tax will be forced on every single individual every single month for the rest of their lives simply because they did not sign up for this confusing and sometimes less beneficial Medicare part D program.

For over a month, Democrats have come to this floor almost daily urging Republicans to join us in preventing this grave injustice from taking place on May 15. Time is running out for Congress to do the right thing and support this extension. America seniors cannot afford a Bush prescription drug tax.

CONDEMNING MEXICO'S DECRIMINALIZATION OF DRUGS

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about some things the protesters did not mention yesterday. Millions of American young people who travel to Mexico for spring break and summer vacation will now legally be able to use cocaine, heroin, ecstasy, and marijuana because the Mexican government just voted to legalize the possession of these drugs in small quantities.

How much is okay? Two ecstasy pills, four joints, four lines of cocaine, and 25 milligrams of heroin are now all allowed.

Are you surprised? Earlier this year, the Mexican government provided maps to illegals to help them cross our borders. The Mexican military recently got caught providing an armed escort to Mexican drug dealers into Texas. And Mexico's president, along with a million protesters, now want us to reward illegal behavior with amnesty and permanent citizenship. Why? So they can earn money here and send it back to Mexico. After all, at \$16 billion, it is Mexico's second highest source revenue behind oil.

It makes you wonder. Were people protesting the wrong government yesterday?

GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Yes, there was a tremendous amount of demonstrating on yesterday, and people concerned about immigration were marching. But then also there were those of us marching who were concerned about genocide in the region of Darfur: Genocide that should never be allowed in a civilized society; genocide that this country and other nations throughout the world have stood idly by while hundreds of thousands of individuals are being killed, murdered, raped. It is the shame of the century. Our Nation can do better, and the world can do better. We must stop the genocide in Darfur.

AMERICA'S ENERGY NEEDS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, the average cost of a gallon of unregulated gasoline in Columbia, South Carolina, is 72 cents higher than the price of May 2005.

Yesterday, I met with dozens of constituents at the West Metro Chamber of Commerce building who expressed their serious concerns about the rising gas prices and America's energy crisis. Fortunately, Republican leaders have announced a series of realistic, short-term steps to reduce the cost of gasoline. By opening up ANWR, banning price gouging, streamlining boutique fuels, and encouraging innovation for advancements in hydrogen technology, we are supporting realistic measures that will immediately help American families.

As we continue to actively address America's energy needs, Minority Leader PELOSI and House Democrats should support this critical mission. Gas prices continue to soar, and our country cannot afford for Democrats to continue to support policies that restrict American energy supplies.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

IRAQ INSURGENT'S EUROPEAN FUNDRAISING

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we know that the Iraqi insurgent terrorists are shameless in their conduct. From blowing up crowded streets full of citizens to beheading innocent noncombatants, their ruthless brand of violence is well documented. What is not so well known is the funding sources these terrorists use to carry out their atrocities.

Thanks to the leadership of my colleague, SUE KELLY, some of the most outrageous fundraising sources for the Iraqi terrorists have recently come to light.

One fundraising campaign, called 10 Euros for Resistance, uses posters of bloody American soldiers to solicit funding in Europe. So far, it appears the terrorist extremists have found sympathetic radicals in more than one European country to donate to their cause. The funding is then funneled to Iraq, where insurgent terrorists use it to finance more attacks on American forces and innocent civilians.

This is an outrage, Mr. Speaker; and I applaud Congresswoman KELLY's efforts to call attention to it. European countries should be doing all they can to stop this fundraising practice within their borders. I do not think that is too much to ask of our allies.

MEDICARE PART D

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share yet another Medicare

part D success story. My colleagues might have noticed that I am sharing a different success story each week, which is pretty easy to do because the stories just keep rolling in. This week I would like to tell you about Mae Thacker of Bartow County, Georgia.

Mae and her husband came into my office unhappy. They had heard some disparaging things about Medicare part D and weren't sure if the program would even save them any money. Fortunately, the more the Thackers learned about part D, the more they wanted to enroll, another case of reality trumping rhetoric. I am happy to report that Mae Thacker is now signed up for a prescription drug plan, and her monthly medicine bill has dropped from \$780 to \$180.

Mr. Speaker, the May 15 enrollment deadline is less than 2 weeks away. Enrolled seniors are saving an average of \$1,100 a year with Medicare part D, \$3,700 a year for low-income seniors.

So my message to seniors is this: Sign up now and start saving.

TOP 100 HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS. Mr. Speaker, each year Newsweek recognizes the top 100 schools in the United States. At the very top of the list, number one and number eight are right in the middle of my district. Not a pretty area, but wonderful education.

I am very proud to announce that the School for Talented and Gifted at Yvonne A. Ewell Townview Center was recognized as the number one high school in the country. Additionally, the School of Science and Engineering at the same school was ranked number eight.

For those who live in Dallas, this honor comes as no surprise. The President visited earlier this year, and each day talented students are challenged with rigorous coursework and provided with an outstanding teacher environment. Townview truly excels and proves that, it really proves that children, given the right environment, can learn.

Townview Center has managed to bridge the achievement gap that exists in schools throughout this country. Two-thirds of Townview students are minorities. These students are not only passing, they are excelling.

Townview has recognized that we must provide all of our students with the opportunity to pursue higher education. It is this commitment to success that distinguishes Townview.

I would like to congratulate the School for the Talented and Gifted and the School of Science and Engineering on this honor.

And also commend the leadership and commitment of Superintendent Hinojosa, Executive Principal Alice Black, Principal Michael Satarino, and Principal Richard White.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION PART D

(Ms. HART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, the results are in on the new prescription drug program, and they are very encouraging. Nowhere is the success of this new prescription drug benefit more apparent than my home State of Pennsylvania.

Take these statistics into consideration. As of April 1, more than 1.2 million Pennsylvanians have enrolled in the new program. In my district alone, 73 percent of Medicare beneficiaries now have prescription drug coverage, and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services project that that number will be near 100 percent by the end of this year.

With the May 15 enrollment deadline fast approaching, we should be doing everything we can to help seniors enroll in the new part D program so they can realize the incredible savings the plan offers.

Take the story about Tom and Dolores from Pittsburgh. Tom and Dolores need about a dozen medications, and they feared that they soon would not be able to afford these medicines. They were also afraid that they would not be able to find a plan in their prescription drug program that would cover all the medications that they need as well as their costs. With help from their Medicare Today counselor, both Tom and Dolores found plans that work for them. They now expect to save over \$2,000 a year on their costs.

I encourage any Medicare recipient who is not yet enrolled to seek some information from Medicare Today and find out the savings it offers through Medicare part D.

□ 1415

DEFENDING AMERICA

(Mr. FRANKS of Arizona asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise for all of us to remind ourselves every day that our primary purpose for being here is defending this country against military threats and defending the constitutional rights of our citizens. In terms of defending this country, we have to continue to remind ourselves every day that there is a growing military build-up in China that is unprecedented in the world. We face an ideological enemy in terrorism that if left unchecked will mean humanity will ultimately never sleep again.

We face a growing nuclear threat in Iran that could destabilize the whole world in a matter of months or years.

Those who would undermine the defense of this country for political purposes disgrace this body and disgrace America. I pray that we will always remember, as George Orwell said, that we

sleep in our beds safe at night because rough men stand ready to visit violence on those who would do us harm.

May we continue to defend this Nation. May we continue to defend the constitutional rights of our citizens, and may we always remind ourselves of the price that military heroes of the past have paid so that can happen.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

RECORD votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

EARL D. HUTTO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5107) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1400 West Jordan Street in Pensacola, Florida, as the "Earl D. Hutto Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EARL D. HUTTO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1400 West Jordan Street in Pensacola, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Earl D. Hutto Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Earl D. Hutto Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5107, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), would designate the post office building in Pensacola, Florida, as the "Earl D. Hutto Post Office Building." All Members of the Florida

delegation have cosponsored this delegation.

Earl Hutto was born near Midland City, Alabama, and was educated in the public schools, graduating from Dale County High School in Ozark, Alabama. He served in the U.S. Navy as a seaman first class aboard heavy cruiser USS *Bremerton*. After graduating with degrees in business, English, and education in 1949, he went on to teach business at Cottonwood High School in Alabama for 2 years.

Later in his professional life, Hutto became the program director, sports director and announcer for WDIG in Dothan, Alabama, for 3 years. As his television career developed, he relocated to the State of Florida and became the sports director and State news editor of WJHG-TV in Panama City, Florida.

In 1972, he was elected to the Florida house of representatives where he served three terms. In 1978, he was elected to the U.S. Congress and served eight terms until his retirement in 1995. His dedication to Florida politics earned him such awards as Legislator of the Year by the Florida Association of Retarded Citizens, Legislator of the Year by the Florida Community College Association, and was named Watchdog of the Treasury for six straight Congresses.

I urge all Members to pay homage to a legislator who was truly dedicated to working for his constituents in every way by passing H.R. 5107.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 5107, legislation naming the postal facility in Pensacola, Florida, after Earl D. Hutto.

This measure, sponsored by Mr. Jeff Miller of Florida, has been cosponsored by the entire Florida delegation.

Earl Hutto was born in Alabama on May 12, 1926. He attended Dale County public schools and graduated from Troy State University. He did graduate work in broadcasting and served in World War II in the United States Navy. Prior to serving in the Florida legislature, Earl Hutto worked as a sports director and president of radio stations. He was elected to the Florida legislature in 1972 and reelected in 1974 and 1976.

In 1979, Earl Hutto was elected to represent the First Congressional District of Florida in the U.S. Congress where he served until 1995 when he did not seek reelection. Since then, former Representative Hutto has retired and remains active in his Pensacola community. It is my understanding that Representative Hutto will be celebrating his 80th birthday on May 12. I am sure my colleagues join me in wishing him a great day and many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the political legacy of Earl Hutto and urge the swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of renaming the Jordan Street Post Office in Pensacola to the Earl D. Hutto Post Office Building.

Congressman Hutto represented the First Congressional District from 1978 to 1994. An interesting piece of trivia is that Mr. Hutto's initial congressional office was, in fact, temporarily located in what is now called the Jordan Street Post Office Building.

Congressman Hutto's life is a tale of a man who has achieved the American Dream. Born into a poor, hardworking family in Midland City, Alabama, Earl was the first in his family to graduate from high school and to graduate from college. After several years in the broadcasting business and earning the nickname Captain Supreme from participating in an ice cream commercial, Congressman Hutto entered the life of public service. In 1972, he began his distinguished career in the Florida house of representatives, serving three terms there before running for the U.S. House of Representatives.

In 1978, like all new Members of Congress in search of office space, Mr. Hutto was lucky enough to draw number 43 in the House lottery to choose his new office space. Drawing the slip of paper with a room on the fifth floor of Cannon on it, the next day the Pensacola News Journal, our home town newspaper, ran the headline, "Hutto in Old Attic." Like many of us, his desk was here in Washington; however, his home and his heart were planted in Florida's gulf coast.

Congressman Hutto quickly earned the respect of his peers and his colleagues in Washington with his commonsense and straightforward dealings on legislative matters. With a conservative home district, he was known by his constituents as a "Boll Weevil," a group of fiscally and socially conservative Southern Democrats.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, he worked tirelessly for the benefit of our military men and women at home and overseas. Under his leadership, he helped create the U.S. Special Operations Command in which the Joint Special Operations University resides on Hurlburt Field in Fort Walton Beach, Florida.

Congressman Hutto learned early on with God and family as your moral compass, you cannot be steered wrong. As a family man, he is quick to credit his wife, Nancy, and his two daughters, Lori Hutto and Amy Stubblefield, for his accomplishments and strength of character.

Congressman Hutto spent eight terms in the U.S. House before retiring in Pensacola. Today, he stays busy with his church, his Rotary Club, and participation on a number of charitable boards. He also sponsors golf tournaments to fund scholarship endowments at five area institutions through his foundation. As you can see, Mr. Hutto was and continues to be a trusted face and voice throughout northwest Florida. We are very fortunate to have such a distinguished gentleman with a genuine concern for local issues representing them in Washington, D.C.

So on behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to thank Earl Hutto for his 22 years of public service in the U.S. House of Representatives and wish him an early happy 80th birthday.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to declare my support for H.R. 5107, a House measure offered by U.S. Rep. JEFF MILLER, R-Florida, to designate the United States Post Office at 1400 West Jordan Street in Pensacola, Florida the "Earl D. Hutto Post Office."

Congressman EARL HUTTO proudly served Florida's first district from 1979 to 1995. He was a strong voice for his district on the House Armed Services Committee where he rose to the position of chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee. During Democrat and Republican administrations, he was an effective and reliable advocate for our military men and women and a credit to the U.S. House.

Earl and I go way back and it turns out we have a lot in common. In addition to having served in the House together, we both hail from a media background. He chose broadcasting and I worked for 30 years in print journalism. But even more unique is the fact that he and I both come from the tiny Dale County, Alabama town of Midland City. As remarkable as it may sound, and we did not realize it until we both came to Congress, but Earl and I even lived in the same Midland City house at different times.

I have missed Earl's presence here in the House since his well deserved retirement and I was pleased to speak at a ceremony honoring him last year at his alma mater, Troy University, in my district.

I wish Earl and his wife Nancy all the best as they continue to enjoy life back in Pensacola. This House and the people have not forgotten their contributions to our country.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in this chamber, even on the most partisan and bitter debates, it is both customary and a proud tradition to refer to our colleagues as the "distinguished gentleman" or the "distinguished gentle lady."

From time-to-time the American people actually see Members of this body who truly fit the description of their honorary titles. Today, we honor one such person—a distinguished gentleman if there ever was one—Congressman Earl Hutto of Florida's 1st Congressional District.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Chumuckla, my very good friend, Congressman JEFF MILLER, for bringing this resolution to the floor today and for finding this way—and a very appropriate opportunity that it is—to honor and pay tribute to Earl Hutto, a man of the House, a man of integrity and a man for whom many of us hold in the highest regards.

As Congressman MILLER and I have discussed numerous times, it is both a tremen-

dous honor—and at times it can be a little intimidating—to follow a real legend in this hallowed chamber.

Like my predecessor, Congressman Sonny Callahan, the name Earl Hutto is synonymous with all the good qualities of a truly outstanding public servant—honesty, trustworthiness, love of country, love of family, humility, faith, and integrity. I cannot imagine a more principled man has ever been elected to serve in this city, and I know—first-hand—that no one has ever worked harder or more tirelessly on behalf of his constituents than Earl Hutto.

A native of Midland City, a small town near Dothan in Alabama's Wiregrass, Earl knew that three qualities—honesty, hard work, and being a man of your word—were essential if you were to be successful in the game of life.

Early on, young Earl Hutto recognized that he had a duty to his country and he served in the U.S. Navy as a Seaman First Class. Later, he attended Troy State University on the G.I. Bill and graduated with a B.S. degree in Business-English-Education in 1949.

Although he had a brief stint teaching high school, Earl had a God-given talent for broadcasting, and in no time, Earl Hutto became a household name in places like Dothan, Montgomery, Pensacola, and Panama City. As sports director, of WSFA-TV in Montgomery, Earl was the host of Coach Shug Jordan's statewide telecast which—with all due respect to our work up here—may still rank higher in the eyes of the Auburn football nation than any elected office on the face of the earth.

After a highly successful career in broadcasting, Earl opened his own advertising agency and soon embarked on a path that led him into public service. He was elected to the Florida House of Representatives in 1972, where he served three terms, and was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1978 where he served eight terms until his retirement in 1995.

Earl Hutto was a "blue dog" before there was such a thing. He fought for a stronger national defense and was always a true friend to the men and women who wear the uniform of their nation's military.

On fiscal matters, Earl was a longtime proponent of getting our budget balanced and not spending more than we take in, and he was one of the early advocates of a biennial budgeting process—something many of us still believe would help restore some fiscal sanity to the process.

Whether there was a Democrat in the White House or a Republican, Earl Hutto always attempted to vote the right way and do the right thing. He always put his country first—well above any loyalty to a political party.

Mr. Speaker, knowing Earl Hutto as I do, I am sure the last thing he would want is some building with his name on it—that was never what motivated Earl in the least bit. However, in this day and age where there is so much partisan divide in our country, I can't think of a better time or more appropriate opportunity for those of us in this body to come together—Democrats and Republicans alike—and pay a lasting tribute to who made this House a better place—Congressman Earl Hutto.

Earl, may you and Nancy, Lori and Amy, and your beautiful granddaughters Ellie and Abbie know that your legacy is living on and your service to others continues to inspire a whole new generation of leaders.

Again, I thank my friend, JEFF MILLER, for bringing this matter before the House, and I urge unanimous adoption of the resolution.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 5107, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5107.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4811) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 West Industrial Park Road in Harrison, Arkansas, as the "John Paul Hammerschmidt Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 215 West Industrial Park Road in Harrison, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the "John Paul Hammerschmidt Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John Paul Hammerschmidt Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4811, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), would designate the post office building in Harrison, Arkansas, as the John Paul Hammerschmidt Post Office Building.

Congressman John Paul Hammerschmidt represented the Third District of Arkansas in the U.S. House of Representatives in the 90th Congress through the 102nd Congress. He was elected to 13 terms and served 26 years during the administrations of six Presidents. During his years in Congress,

John Paul Hammerschmidt became known for his attention to individual constituent service and communication, his high voting and attendance record during congressional sessions during the business week, and routinely working weekends in Arkansas. Also, his legislative expertise in highways, airports, water supply and distribution systems, as well as veterans hospitals, will continue to benefit from his diligent stewardship long into the future.

Since retiring from Congress, Hammerschmidt has continued to participate in Arkansas civil involvements as a private citizen, chairing the Northwest Arkansas Council and March of Dimes Arkansas Citizen of the Year Dinner. Because of his dedication to government at all levels, I ask all Members to honor his integrity and perseverance by passing H.R. 4811.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4811, legislation naming a postal facility in Harrison, Arkansas, after John Paul Hammerschmidt. This measure was sponsored by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) on February 28, 2006, and unanimously reported by our committee on March 30, 2006. The bill has the support and cosponsorship of the entire Arkansas delegation and 112 Members of Congress.

A native of Arkansas, John Hammerschmidt was born in Harrison in 1922.

□ 1430

He graduated from Harrison High School and attended the Citadel, University of Arkansas and Oklahoma State University. He served in the U.S. Army Air Corps from 1942 to 1945, the U.S. Air Force Reserves from 1945 to 1960, and the District of Columbia Army Reserves from 1970 to 1981.

After holding senior positions in the lumber and construction industry, John was elected to represent the 3rd Congressional District of Arkansas. He was subsequently elected to 13 terms, serving in Congress from 1967 until 1993.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift passage of H.R. 4811, which seeks to honor the broad legacy of former Representative Hammerschmidt.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to be here to participate in this naming of the United States Post Office after John Hammerschmidt. It is a life that certainly is representative of a true American patriot and servant of the people.

He was a member of the United States Army Air Corps during World War II, a member of the Air Force Reserves, a member of the District of Columbia Army Reserves, the first Republican Member to represent Arkansas since reconstruction, also a member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airport. These are just a few of the roles in which Congressman John Paul Hammerschmidt has served; and, as I said, it truly is a life of service to his country.

First elected to the House of Representatives in 1966, John Paul Hammerschmidt was noted for his dedication and attention to constituent services. A native son of Harrison, Arkansas, Congressman Hammerschmidt went on to represent the region for 13 consecutive terms. In all of those elections, only two of Congressman Hammerschmidt's opponents were able to achieve more than one-third of the vote, and that included one candidate by the name of Bill Clinton.

During his tenure in the House, Congressman Hammerschmidt was known for his expertise regarding infrastructure and veterans-related issues. As the ranking member of the Public Works Committee from 1986 to 1993, John was influential in many of the improvements that have taken place on our Nation's highways, airports and waterway systems. John was a true steward of our Nation's infrastructure; and users of roads, water systems and the airways will all long benefit from his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, my father, Bud Shuster, had the pleasure of serving with Congressman Hammerschmidt both in the House and on the Public Works Committee for many years. I asked him to relate a few stories, reflections on John Paul Hammerschmidt, and he said he certainly was one of the experts on infrastructure in this country. And then he said quite simply, "He is a gentleman's gentleman;" and I think that is a very accurate assessment of Congressman John Paul Hammerschmidt.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the measure offered by my colleague, Mr. BOOZMAN, to name the post office in Harrison, Arkansas, after Congressman John Paul Hammerschmidt.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, once again I have to call attention to the fact, while Mr. DAVIS is here today in his role as a congressman from Illinois, he is an Arkansas native; and we are proud to have him always in this body but particularly on these bills involving Arkansans.

I just want to take a minute and add my voice in praise of Congressman Hammerschmidt. This is not the first honor he has received. It will not be the last. He is a kind, intelligent man with good judgment, always very professional throughout his career in his

dealings with everyone, regardless of party or class or financial status. He certainly had strong opinions and had his own sense of what was right and wrong, but he always worked in a bipartisan manner.

After retiring from this body, he has continued to be very active both in Arkansas and nationally; and maybe with the passage of time, as buildings come and go and names come and go, at some point this facility may be renamed, or it may be torn down and a new facility built and some other name will be attached to it. But I can guarantee you it will not be anyone more professional or kind or with a better sense of treating people well than Congressman Hammerschmidt.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also would echo the fact that Congressman DAVIS is an Arkansan; and we are very, very proud of him and all that he has accomplished.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4811, the John Paul Hammerschmidt Post Office Designation Act. No one understands my congressional district like the kind and thoughtful gentleman who represented much of Arkansas in the Congress from 1967 through 1993. I consider John Paul Hammerschmidt a mentor and a friend.

During his 26 years in Congress, John Paul became known for his strong work ethic and attention to individual constituent service. His fellow Members came to rely on his legislative expertise in highways, aviation and waterway infrastructure. In fact, Congressman Hammerschmidt served as ranking member of the Public Works, now known as the Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee from 1986 through 1993.

During his tenure in office, Arkansas completed many of the infrastructure improvements, including highways and airports, that have allowed northwest Arkansas to become one of the major financial engines of our Nation.

Congressman Hammerschmidt is also remembered for his work on behalf of our Nation's veterans. Particularly in Arkansas, our veterans hospitals and facilities still benefit from Congressman Hammerschmidt's service.

Congressman Hammerschmidt served as ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee from 1975 through 1986, and all of our Nation's veterans had a tremendous advocate in this good man.

As a combat pilot in World War II, Congressman Hammerschmidt flew 217 missions with the Third Combat Cargo Group over "the Hump" in the China-Burma-India theatre.

He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross with three oak leaf clusters, the Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters, three Battle Stars, the China War Memorial Medal by the Republic of China, and the Meritorious Service

Award. He retired from the Air Force Reserve as a major. Furthermore, he has been awarded the highest honors by eight national veterans service organizations.

Since retiring, Congressman Hammerschmidt has been named Arkansas Citizen of the Year; and he has remained incredibly active in the fields of business, education, aviation, community service, and his local church.

Many of Congressman Hammerschmidt's close friends continue to serve in Congress today, and several will be submitting statements that were unable to be here today.

Finally, I want to take a moment to honor Ginny Hammerschmidt, who served the people of Arkansas alongside John Paul during his many years of service. We lost Ginny last year, but this bill, in recognizing the service of Congressman Hammerschmidt, also recognizes the sacrifices and service of Ginny and the rest of the family.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this point. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to actually close, and I have no further requests for time.

But, in closing, let me just say, first of all, that I appreciate the kind comments and remarks made by my colleagues from Arkansas. As you can see, there is a tremendous amount of affinity for those of us who grew up in the land of opportunity.

But, also, I note that Representative BOOZMAN's wife came from the town where my family lived, and her uncle was actually the postmaster, and my father used to visit in the post office, along with many other people, and that was kind of like a neighborhood gathering place. That is one of the reasons that we hope that many of the small post offices will be able to remain intact, because they are more than just letter-dispensing areas in many of these communities.

So I commend Representative BOOZMAN for seeking to honor this outstanding American.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for this bill to name a post office in Harrison, Arkansas, in honor of the Honorable John Paul Hammerschmidt, and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor.

I had the distinct honor and privilege of serving for many years with John Paul on what was then known as the Public Works and Transportation Committee—now known as the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He completed his 26 years of service in the House as the ranking minority member of the Committee—and he provided steady leadership as we worked together to build the roads, airports and waterways needed to keep America competitive and prosperous.

He was the ranking member during the legendary ISTEA transportation bill in 1991, which moved us beyond the Interstate construction era and provided a new vision for transportation in the U.S. For many years he was ranking on the Aviation Subcommittee and has always had a keen interest in aviation issues. In 1998, after his retirement from the

House, President Clinton nominated him to serve as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. John Paul led many Committee trips to his district in Northwest Arkansas—and that usually entailed having your photo taken sporting the famous Arkansas Razorback hog hat.

While many of us are familiar with his Congressional career, some may not know of his heroic service to our country during World War II. A member of the Third Combat Cargo Group in the China-Burma-India theater from 1942 to 1945, John Paul flew 217 combat missions—primarily in Burma and China. These missions included drop missions where he dropped supplies to our troops in the jungle, all in an unarmed plane flying low over the jungle in some of the worst weather conditions imaginable while frequently coming under enemy fire. He also “flew the hump” as it was called, dangerous missions high over the Himalayas.

Giving constant support to John Paul was his beloved wife Virginia, who sadly passed away earlier this year. Known to all as Ginny, she was recognized for her compassionate and gentle nature. Together Ginny and John Paul served their district well.

Through John Paul's decades of service to our country, first in the Army Air Corps in World War II, here in the House of Representatives, and even today as he remains active in his community, he is thoroughly deserving of this honor. He served this House with distinction and worked effectively with Members of both parties to move important initiatives forward. He is a true gentleman, and I am proud to call him a friend.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4811.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4811.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNOR JOHN ANDERSON, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4674) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 North Chestnut Street in Olathe, Kansas, as the “Governor John Anderson, Jr. Post Office Building”.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4674

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GOVERNOR JOHN ANDERSON, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 North Chestnut Street in Olathe, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the “Governor John Anderson, Jr. Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Governor John Anderson, Jr. Post Office Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4674, offered by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), would designate the Post Office Building in Olathe, Kansas, as the “Governor John Anderson, Jr. Post Office building”.

John Anderson was born near Olathe, Kansas, in 1917. He earned his undergraduate degree from Kansas State University and from there went on to receive his law degree from the University of Kansas in 1944.

After serving on the staff of U.S. District Court Judge Walter Huxman for 2 years, John Anderson was successful in running for the position of Johnson County Attorney, a capacity in which he served for 6 years. He was a Member of the Kansas State Senate from 1953 to 1956 and was appointed Kansas Attorney General serving in 1956.

In 1960, John Anderson was elected Governor of the State of Kansas and worked tirelessly to revise the State's pardon and parole systems, to create a combined State medical and psychiatric hospital, and to restructure the State's public school system into unified districts.

The hard work and dedication of Governor John Anderson, one of Kansas's most important leaders, should not go unnoticed. I urge all Members to come together and honor a man who strived to achieve excellence in government by passing H.R. 4675.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the sponsor of this legislation, Representative DENNIS MOORE from Kansas.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation I introduced with my Kansas colleagues, TODD TIAHRT, JIM RYUN and JERRY MORAN, to designate the United States Post Office located at 110 North Chestnut Street in Olathe as the “Governor John Anderson, Jr. Post Office Building”.

Governor Anderson was born near Olathe in 1917, educated at Kansas State University and the University of Kansas, where he received a law degree in 1944. After serving on the staff of U.S. District Court Judge Walter Huxman for 2 years, John Anderson won election as Johnson County Attorney in 1947, where he served for 6 years. He was a member of the Kansas State Senate from 1953 to 1956 and was appointed Kansas Attorney General, serving from 1956 to 1961.

He was elected Governor of Kansas in 1960 and 1962, he defeated incumbent Governor George Docking, served as Governor during Kansas's centennial celebration, and appointed James B. Pearson to the United States Senate upon the death of Senator Andrew Schoeppel.

John Anderson's tenure as Kansas Governor was marked by numerous achievements, including revision of the State's pardon and parole systems; creation of a combined State medical and psychiatric hospital; restructuring the State's public school system into unified districts; increasing the State's per-pupil expenditure allowance; addition of the University of Kansas to the State board of regents system; sanctioning of fair employment practices standards; approval of an advanced public employee retirement system; advancements in highway construction; expansion of vocational-technical schools in Kansas; authorization of a State library consultant; improvements in the public welfare system; and reorganization of state agencies, commissions and boards.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation honoring an important Kansas leader is long overdue, and I know that my delegation colleagues look forward with me to its speedy enactment. I thank the leadership of the Government Reform Committee for bringing it before the House in such an expeditious manner, and I urge all of my colleagues to support today this legislation for my friend, Governor John Anderson of Kansas.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time. I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleague in the consideration of H.R. 4674, legislation naming the postal facility in Olathe, Kansas, after Governor John Anderson, Jr. This measure was sponsored by my colleague, Representative DENNIS MOORE, on January 31, 2006, and unanimously reported by our committee on March 9, 2006. The bill has the support and cosponsorship of the entire Kansas delegation.

Born and educated in Kansas, John Anderson became involved in local politics by winning an election for county attorney for Johnson County. He

served three terms and then ran successfully for a seat in the Kansas Senate. John served as a State senator until his appointment as a attorney general, a position he held until he decided to run for Governor of Kansas.

In 1960 John was elected Governor of Kansas and served until 1964. His tenure was marked by a number of achievements, including the restructuring of the State's public school system, expansion of vocational-technical schools, and advancements in highway construction.

After serving as Governor, Mr. Anderson went back to practicing law. He remained involved in public service and is currently retired in Olathe, Kansas.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity actually to see this post office, and Olathe, Kansas, is a beautiful small town, and I would urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4674, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4674.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD BUCCA POST OFFICE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4995) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7 Columbus Avenue in Tuckahoe, New York, as the "Ronald Bucca Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4995

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RONALD BUCCA POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7 Columbus Avenue in Tuckahoe, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Ronald Bucca Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Ronald Bucca Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to

revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4995, offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), would designate the post office building in Tuckahoe, New York, as the "Ronald Bucca Post Office."

Ronald Bucca was nicknamed the "Flying Fireman" in 1986 after he fell spectacularly from a tenement fire escape, spun around a cable strung through a backyard, and lived to tell the tale. His specialty was rescuing frightened people from the smoke and flames of burning buildings during his 23 years as a firefighter. His last 9 years of service he acted as the fire marshal. He was also a former nurse and reservist in the United States Army Special Forces. Bucca was trained as an antiterrorist intelligence expert. And on September 11, 2001, Ronald Bucca responded to his call to duty and headed into the city toward the Twin Towers. In his quest to assist all those trying to flee the fiery scene that day, he lost his life on the 78th floor when the South Tower collapsed in flames.

A valuable member of the fire department and the community, Ronald Bucca is sorely missed; and it is only appropriate that we honor him by passing H.R. 4995.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman and the distinguished chairwoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which would rename the U.S. Post Office in Tuckahoe, New York, after Ronald Bucca. I want to thank Mr. DAVIS and the other members of the Government Reform Committee for their support of this bill.

Born on May 6, 1954, Ronald Bucca spent his life in public service, defending our Nation overseas and protecting our communities here at home. Over the course of his long and distinguished career as a member of the Fire Department of New York, Ron Bucca served with Engine 95, Ladder 2, Rescue 1, the Fire Department of New York Terrorist Task Force and as a fire marshal. During his time with Rescue 1, Ron was severely injured when he fell five stories while attempting to rescue a fellow firefighter. When he triumphantly returned to work, he earned the nickname the "Flying Fireman."

During the 9/11 attacks, Ron Bucca was one of only two firefighters to

reach the fire floor of the South Tower. Along with Chief Palmer, Ron was stretching a hose line into the 78th floor lobby when the tower fell. Ronald Bucca was the first New York City fire marshal to be killed in the line of duty.

In addition to his brave and dedicated career protecting the people of New York, Ronald Bucca also performed heroically as a member of the Armed Forces. During Ron's military career, he spent time with the 11th Special Forces group and the Defense Intelligence Agency, serving as a Special Forces first sergeant, a member of the 101st Airborne Division, and a Special Forces group defense intelligence analyst.

For his brave service to our Nation, the military has also honored Ronald Bucca. When the 800th Military Police Brigade took command of British Enemy Holding Area Freddy in Southern Iraq, it was promptly renamed Camp Bucca.

For Ronald Bucca the military and the fire department honors were just the tip of the iceberg. He was also a licensed practical nurse, held an associate degree in OSHA and fire science from John Jay College, and had a bachelor of science degree in public safety from Mercy College.

For over 20 years Ron and his wife, Eve, made Tuckahoe, New York, their home. Ron was actively involved in his children's education and encouraged their involvement in the Boy Scouts and various other activities.

I believe Ronald Bucca's life can most appropriately be described by those who knew him best, his children. They spoke of him this way: "He was a fireman, a soldier, a nurse, a walking encyclopedia of knowledge, and an adventurer. But most of all, he was one of our best friends and an incredible dad."

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Bucca was a hero in every sense of the word, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring him by passing this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to improve upon such an eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4995, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4995.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT MICHAEL P. MURPHY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 4101) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 East Main Street in Patchogue, New York, as the "LT Michael P. Murphy Post Office Building". The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4101

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIEUTENANT MICHAEL P. MURPHY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 East Main Street in Patchogue, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Lieutenant Michael P. Murphy Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lieutenant Michael P. Murphy Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4101, offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), would designate the post office building in Patchogue, New York, as the "Lieutenant Michael P. Murphy Post Office Building."

Lt. Michael P. Murphy was a true hero in every sense of the word. At the age of 29, Lieutenant Murphy and three of his Navy SEAL comrades were killed during an ambush by Taliban insurgents while serving our country in Afghanistan. Lieutenant Murphy will not be forgotten, as he was universally loved and admired. In fact, his Navy SEAL commanding officer remembers him as being "a very focused young man with a terrific attitude, quiet intensity and determination."

Lieutenant Murphy graduated from Penn State University; and after his military service, he planned to attend law school and was engaged to be married. He truly enjoyed life. As his father recalls, "He squeezed more life in 29 years than I will ever see."

I ask all Members to come together and honor this brave young man for his service to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. DAVIS for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4101, which I proudly introduced last October on behalf of all 29 members of the New York delegation in the House.

Our bill names the U.S. Post Office on 170 East Main Street in Patchogue, New York, in honor of a fallen neighbor and decorated hero of the United States Navy's elite Sea-Air-Land forces, Lt. Michael P. Murphy, who was killed in action on the evening of June 28, 2005, while tracking insurgent Taliban and al Qaeda movements in the mountains of the Kubar province of Afghanistan.

For his valor and sacrifice, Lieutenant Murphy was posthumously awarded the Silver Star and the Purple Heart. Approaching the first anniversary of the deaths of Lieutenant Murphy and his fellow SEALs, it is appropriate for this House to once again express the solemn appreciation of a grateful Nation for their sacrifices and to share this tribute with their families.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall the tragic images from around the last July 4 holiday when it was first reported that U.S. Army helicopters carrying two teams of Special Forces, known as the "Night Stalkers," who were attempting a daring rescue of Lieutenant Murphy's unit, were shot down by rocket-propelled grenades over the mountains in Eastern Afghanistan.

That tragic day claimed the lives of 11 SEALs and eight soldiers, representing the single deadliest attack on the U.S. military up to that point in the global war on terror. The Naval Special Warfare Command later confirmed that it was also the single largest loss of life in the history of the Navy SEALs, the smallest of our intrepid Special Operations Forces.

Nearly a thousand people attended Lieutenant Murphy's memorial service at our Lady of Mount Carmel Catholic Church in Patchogue. His parents, Daniel and Maureen, spoke of how their extraordinary son's boundless enthusiasm, generosity, and determination made them so proud of him through the short years they had together. Remembered not only for his courage and for the ultimate sacrifice Lieutenant Murphy made for this country, he will also be admired in our community as one of its favorite sons. At Patchogue-Medford High School, he was an excellent student, awarded by the National Honor Society and accepted to Penn State University, where he majored in political science. He played varsity football, life-guarded along the beaches of Long Island during the summers, and, after graduating from Penn State University, chose the Navy over offers from two law schools.

Like the impeccable reputation he earned in the eyes of the community of Patchogue, Lieutenant Murphy's brilliant naval record reflects his courage, diligence, and steadfast dedication.

With firm resolve and a robust drive toward perfection, he was determined to exceed the SEALs' rigorous physical requirements and was known to perform chin-ups wearing full body armor to stay in shape.

□ 1500

Still, he took the time each day during his deployment to stay in touch with his family and his fiancée, Heather, whom he would have married upon his anticipated return last fall. Through it all, he comforted them with a cheerful outlook and a sense of humor.

Although under the most unfortunate circumstances, I am proud to have come to know the Murphy family over the past year and feel privileged to represent them. Today, it is entirely appropriate that we pay tribute to their son by naming the post office on East Main Street in his hometown in his honor.

On behalf of Eastern Long Island, I thank all of my colleagues in the New York delegation for cosponsoring H.R. 4101, and appreciate the leadership's decision to call this bill to the floor. By passing this legislation, the Murphy family will know that they are in our thoughts and prayers and that our Nation will always honor the memory of their son.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4101.

I thank my colleague from North Carolina for her support of this measure, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a member of the Government Reform Committee, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 4101, legislation naming the postal facility in Patchogue, New York, after LT Michael P. Murphy.

This measure was sponsored by Representative TIMOTHY BISHOP of New York on October 20, 2005, and unanimously reported by our committee on November 16, 2005. The bill, of course, has the support and cosponsorship of the entire New York delegation.

Michael Murphy of Patchogue, New York, was a 29-year-old lieutenant serving with a four-man SEAL reconnaissance team that called for help when his SEAL team was ambushed by Taliban fighters in Kunar Province, Afghanistan, on June 28, 2005. His remains were found during a combat search and rescue operation on July 4, 2005. Lieutenant Murphy was assigned to SEAL Delivery Vehicle Team One, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.

Michael Murphy was a graduate of Patchogue-Medford High School in New York and Penn State university. He chose to defer law school until he had completed his tour of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for seeking to honor the ultimate sacrifice of this war hero by dedicating the Patchogue Post Office in his honor. I urge swift passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 4101, and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4101.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIVE AMERICAN TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2006

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3351) to make technical corrections to laws relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2006”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICANS

Sec. 101. Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act technical amendment.

Sec. 102. ANCSA amendment.

Sec. 103. Mississippi Band of Choctaw transportation reimbursement.

Sec. 104. Fallon Paiute Shoshone tribes settlement.

TITLE II—INDIAN LAND LEASING

Sec. 201. Prairie Island land conveyance.

Sec. 202. Authorization of 99-year leases.

Sec. 203. Certification of rental proceeds.

TITLE III—NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FUNDING AMENDMENT

Sec. 301. National Indian Gaming Commission funding amendment.

TITLE IV—INDIAN FINANCING

Sec. 401. Indian Financing Act Amendments.

TITLE V—NATIVE AMERICAN PROBATE REFORM TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

Sec. 501. Clarification of provisions and amendments relating to inheritance of Indian lands.

TITLE I—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICANS

SEC. 101. ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

(a)(1) Section 337(a) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (Division F of Public Law 108-7; 117 Stat. 278; February 20, 2003) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Section 1629b of title 43, United States Code,” and inserting “Section 36 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629b)”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “by creating the following new subsection:” and inserting “in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “by creating the following new subsection:” and inserting “by adding at the end the following:”.

(2) Section 36 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629b) is amended in subsection (f), by striking “section 1629e of this title” and inserting “section 39”.

(b)(1) Section 337(b) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (Division F of Public Law 108-7; 117 Stat. 278; February 20, 2003) is amended by striking “Section 1629e(a)(3) of title 43, United States Code,” and inserting “Section 39(a)(3) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629e(a)(3))”.

(2) Section 39(a)(3)(B)(ii) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1629e(a)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “(a)(4) of section 1629b of this title” and inserting “section 36(a)(4)”.

(c) The amendments made by this section take effect on February 20, 2003.

SEC. 102. ANCSA AMENDMENT.

All land and interests in land in the State of Alaska conveyed by the Federal Government under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) to a Native Corporation and reconveyed by that Native Corporation, or a successor in interest, in exchange for any other land or interest in land in the State of Alaska and located within the same region (as defined in section 9(a) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1608(a)), to a Native Corporation under an exchange or other conveyance, shall be deemed, notwithstanding the conveyance or exchange, to have been conveyed pursuant to that Act.

SEC. 103. MISSISSIPPI BAND OF CHOCTAW TRANSPORTATION REIMBURSEMENT.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, within the 3-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, to accept funds from the State of Mississippi pursuant to the contract signed by the Mississippi Department of Transportation on June 7, 2005, and by the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians on June 2, 2005. The amount shall not exceed \$776,965.30 and such funds shall be deposited in the trust account numbered PL7489708 at the Office of Trust Funds Management for the benefit of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians. Thereafter, the tribe may draw down these moneys from this trust account by resolution of the Tribal Council, pursuant to Federal law and regulations applicable to such accounts.

SEC. 104. FALLON PAIUTE SHOSHONE TRIBES SETTLEMENT.

(a) *SETTLEMENT FUND.*—Section 102 of the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Indian Tribes Water Rights Settlement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-618; 104 Stat. 3289) is amended—

(1) in subsection (C)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking the matter preceding subparagraph (a) and inserting the following: “Notwithstanding any conflicting provision in the original Fund plan during Fund fiscal year 2006 or any subsequent Fund fiscal year, 6 percent of the average quarterly market value of the Fund during the immediately preceding 3 Fund fiscal years (referred to in this title as the ‘Annual 6 percent Amount’), plus any unexpended and unobligated portion of the Annual 6 percent Amount from any of the 3 immediately preceding Fund fiscal years that are subsequent to Fund fiscal year 2005, less any negative income that may accrue on that portion, may be expended or obligated only for the following purposes:”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Fees and expenses incurred in connection with the investment of the Fund, for investment management, investment consulting, custodianship, and other transactional services or matters.”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) No monies from the Fund other than the amounts authorized under paragraphs (1) and (3) may be expended or obligated for any purpose.

“(5) Notwithstanding any conflicting provision in the original Fund plan, during Fund fiscal year 2006 and during each subsequent Fund fiscal year, not more than 20 percent of the Annual 6 percent Amount for the Fund fiscal year (referred to in this title as the ‘Annual 1.2 percent Amount’) may be expended or obligated under paragraph (1)(c) for per capita distributions to tribal members, except that during each Fund fiscal year subsequent to Fund fiscal year 2006, any unexpended and unobligated portion of the Annual 1.2 percent Amount from any of the 3 immediately preceding Fund fiscal years that are subsequent to Fund fiscal year 2005, less any negative income that may accrue on that portion, may also be expended or obligated for such per capita payments.”; and

(2) in subsection (D), by adding at the end the following: “Notwithstanding any conflicting provision in the original Fund plan, the Fallon Business Council, in consultation with the Secretary, shall promptly amend the original Fund plan for purposes of conforming the Fund plan to this title and making nonsubstantive updates, improvements, or corrections to the original Fund plan.”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 107 of the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Indian Tribes Water Rights Settlement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-618; 104 Stat. 3293) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (D), (E), (F), and (G) as subsections (F), (G), (H), and (I), respectively; and

(2) by striking subsections (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

“(B) the term ‘Fund fiscal year’ means a fiscal year of the Fund (as defined in the Fund plan);

“(C) the term ‘Fund plan’ means the plan established under section 102(F), including the original Fund plan (the ‘Plan for Investment, Management, Administration and Expenditure dated December 20, 1991’) and all amendments of the Fund plan under subsection (D) or (F)(1) of section 102;

“(D) the term ‘income’ means the total net return from the investment of the Fund, consisting of all interest, dividends, realized and unrealized gains and losses, and other earnings, less all related fees and expenses incurred for investment management, investment consulting, custodianship and transactional services or matters;

“(E) the term ‘principal’ means the total amount appropriated to the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribal Settlement Fund under section 102(B);”.

TITLE II—INDIAN LAND LEASING

SEC. 201. PRAIRIE ISLAND LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b), including all improvements, cultural resources, and sites on the land, subject to the flowage and sloughing easement described in subsection (d) and to the conditions stated in subsection (f), to the Secretary of the Interior, to be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Prairie Island Indian Community in Minnesota; and

(2) included in the Prairie Island Indian Community Reservation in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land to be conveyed under subsection (a) is the approximately 1290 acres of land associated with the Lock and Dam #3 on the Mississippi River in Goodhue County, Minnesota, located in tracts identified as GO-251, GO-252, GO-271, GO-277, GO-278, GO-284, GO-301 through GO-313, GO-314A, GO-314B, GO-329, GO-330A, GO-330B, GO-331A, GO-331B, GO-331C, GO-332, GO-333, GO-334,

GO-335A, GO-335B, GO-336 through GO-338, GO-339A, GO-339B, GO-339C, GO-339D, GO-339E, GO-340A, GO-340B, GO-358, GO-359A, GO-359B, GO-359C, GO-359D, and GO-360, as depicted on the map entitled “United States Army Corps of Engineers survey map of the Upper Mississippi River 9-Foot Project, Lock & Dam No. 3 (Red Wing), Land & Flowage Rights” and dated December 1936.

(c) BOUNDARY SURVEY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of conveyance under subsection (a), the boundaries of the land conveyed shall be surveyed as provided in section 2115 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 176).

(d) EASEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Corps of Engineers shall retain a flowage and sloughing easement for the purpose of navigation and purposes relating to the Lock and Dam No. 3 project over the portion of the land described in subsection (b) that lies below the elevation of 676.0.

(2) INCLUSIONS.—The easement retained under paragraph (1) includes—

(A) the perpetual right to overflow, flood, and submerge property as the District Engineer determines to be necessary in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Mississippi River Navigation Project; and

(B) the continuing right to clear and remove any brush, debris, or natural obstructions that, in the opinion of the District Engineer, may be detrimental to the project.

(e) OWNERSHIP OF STURGEON LAKE BED UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section diminishes or otherwise affects the title of the State of Minnesota to the bed of Sturgeon Lake located within the tracts of land described in subsection (b).

(f) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) is subject to the conditions that the Prairie Island Indian Community shall not—

(1) use the conveyed land for human habitation;

(2) construct any structure on the land without the written approval of the District Engineer; or

(3) conduct gaming (within the meaning of section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)) on the land.

(g) NO EFFECT ON ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the conveyance under subsection (a), the land shall continue to be eligible for environmental management planning and other recreational or natural resource development projects on the same basis as before the conveyance.

(h) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section diminishes or otherwise affects the rights granted to the United States pursuant to letters of July 23, 1937, and November 20, 1937, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of War and the letters of the Secretary of War in response to the Secretary of the Interior dated August 18, 1937, and November 27, 1937, under which the Secretary of the Interior granted certain rights to the Corps of Engineers to overflow the portions of Tracts A, B, and C that lie within the Mississippi River 9-Foot Channel Project boundary and as more particularly shown and depicted on the map entitled “United States Army Corps of Engineers survey map of the Upper Mississippi River 9-Foot Project, Lock & Dam No. 3 (Red Wing), Land & Flowage Rights” and dated December 1936.

SEC. 202. AUTHORIZATION OF 99-YEAR LEASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended in the second sentence—

(1) by striking “Moapa Indian reservation” and inserting “Moapa Indian Reservation”; and

(2) by inserting “the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation,” before “the Burns Paiute Reservation”; and

(3) by inserting “the” before “Yavapai-Prescott”; and

(4) by inserting “the Muckleshoot Indian Reservation and land held in trust for the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe,” after “the Cabazon Indian Reservation.”;

(5) by striking “lands comprising the Moses Allotment Numbered 10, Chelan County, Washington,” and inserting “the lands comprising the Moses Allotment Numbered 8 and the Moses Allotment Numbered 10, Chelan County, Washington.”;

(6) by inserting “land held in trust for the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation,” before “lands held in trust for the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma”; and

(7) by inserting “land held in trust for the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribes,” before “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara”; and

(8) by inserting “land held in trust for the Yurok Tribe, land held in trust for the Hopland Band of Pomo Indians of the Hopland Rancheria,” after “Pueblo of Santa Clara.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any lease entered into or renewed after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. CERTIFICATION OF RENTAL PROCEEDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any actual rental proceeds from the lease of land acquired under the first section of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for loans to Indian tribes and tribal corporations, and for other purposes” (25 U.S.C. 488) certified by the Secretary of the Interior shall be deemed—

(1) to constitute the rental value of that land; and

(2) to satisfy the requirement for appraisal of that land.

TITLE III—NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FUNDING AMENDMENT

SEC. 301. NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FUNDING AMENDMENT.

(a) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—Section 7 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2706) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out any action under this Act, the Commission shall be subject to the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62; 107 Stat. 285).

“(2) PLANS.—In addition to any plan required under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62; 107 Stat. 285), the Commission shall submit a plan to provide technical assistance to tribal gaming operations in accordance with that Act.”.

(b) COMMISSION FUNDING.—Section 18(a)(2) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2717(a)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) The total amount of all fees imposed during any fiscal year under the schedule established under paragraph (1) shall not exceed 0.080 percent of the gross gaming revenues of all gaming operations subject to regulation under this Act.”.

TITLE IV—INDIAN FINANCING

SEC. 401. INDIAN FINANCING ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1481) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 201. In order” and inserting the following:

“SEC. 201. LOAN GUARANTIES AND INSURANCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order”;

(2) by striking “the Secretary is authorized (a) to guarantee” and inserting “the Secretary may—

“(1) guarantee”; and

(3) by striking “members; and (b) in lieu of such guaranty, to insure” and inserting “members; or

“(2) insure”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) ELIGIBLE BORROWERS.—The Secretary may guarantee or insure loans under subsection (a) to both for-profit and nonprofit borrowers.”.

(b) SALE OR ASSIGNMENT OF LOANS AND UNDERLYING SECURITY.—Section 205 of the Indian

Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1485) is amended—

(1) by striking “SEC. 205.” and all that follows through subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 205. SALE OR ASSIGNMENT OF LOANS AND UNDERLYING SECURITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—All or any portion of a loan guaranteed or insured under this title, including the security given for the loan—

“(1) may be transferred by the lender by sale or assignment to any person; and

“(2) may be retransferred by the transferee.

“(b) TRANSFERS OF LOANS.—With respect to a transfer described in subsection (a)—

“(1) the transfer shall be consistent with such regulations as the Secretary shall promulgate under subsection (h); and

“(2) the transferee shall give notice of the transfer to the Secretary.”;

(2) by striking subsection (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(4) in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) VALIDITY.—Except as provided in regulations in effect on the date on which a loan is made, the validity of a guarantee or insurance of a loan under this title shall be incontestable.”;

(5) in subsection (e) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) COMPENSATION OF FISCAL TRANSFER AGENT.—A fiscal transfer agent designated under subsection (f) may be compensated through any of the fees assessed under this section and any interest earned on any funds or fees collected by the fiscal transfer agent while the funds or fees are in the control of the fiscal transfer agent and before the time at which the fiscal transfer agent is contractually required to transfer such funds to the Secretary or to transferees or other holders.”; and

(6) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (3))—

(A) by striking “subsection (i)” and inserting “subsection (h)”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “, and issuance of acknowledgments.”;

(c) LOANS INELIGIBLE FOR GUARANTY OR INSURANCE.—Section 206 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1486) is amended by inserting “(not including an eligible Community Development Finance Institution)” after “Government”.

(d) AGGREGATE LOANS OR SURETY BONDS LIMITATION.—Section 217(b) of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1497(b)) is amended by striking “\$500,000,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000,000”.

TITLE V—NATIVE AMERICAN PROBATE REFORM TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

SEC. 501. CLARIFICATION OF PROVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS RELATING TO INHERITANCE OF INDIAN LANDS.

(a) CLARIFICATIONS RELATING TO APPLICABLE LAWS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 207(g)(2) of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2206(g)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “described in paragraph (1)” and inserting “specified in paragraph (1)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “identified in Federal law” and inserting “identified in such law”.

(2) LIMITATION ON EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH.—Section 207(g) of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2206(g)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) LIMITATION ON EFFECT OF PARAGRAPH.—Except to the extent that this Act would amend

or otherwise affect the application of a Federal law specified or described in paragraph (1) or (2), nothing in paragraph (2) limits the application of this Act to trust or restricted land, interests in such land, or any other trust or restricted interests or assets.”.

(b) TRANSFER AND EXCHANGE; LAND FOR WHICH PATENTS HAVE BEEN EXECUTED AND DELIVERED.—

(1) TRANSFER AND EXCHANGE OF LAND.—Section 4 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 464), is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4. TRANSFER AND EXCHANGE OF RESTRICTED INDIAN LANDS AND SHARES OF INDIAN TRIBES AND CORPORATIONS.

“Except as provided in this Act, no sale, devise, gift, exchange, or other transfer of restricted Indian lands or of shares in the assets of any Indian tribe or corporation organized under this Act shall be made or approved: Provided, That such lands or interests may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, be sold, devised, or otherwise transferred to the Indian tribe in which the lands or shares are located or from which the shares were derived, or to a successor corporation; Provided further, That, subject to section 8(b) of the American Indian Probate Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-374; 25 U.S.C. 2201 note), lands and shares described in the preceding proviso shall descend or be devised to any member of an Indian tribe or corporation described in that proviso or to an heir or lineal descendant of such a member in accordance with the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), including a tribal probate code approved, or regulations promulgated under, that Act: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior may authorize any voluntary exchanges of lands of equal value and the voluntary exchange of shares of equal value whenever such exchange, in the judgment of the Secretary, is expedient and beneficial for or compatible with the proper consolidation of Indian lands and for the benefit of cooperative organizations.”.

(2) LAND FOR WHICH PATENTS HAVE BEEN EXECUTED AND DELIVERED.—Section 5 of the Act of February 8, 1887 (25 U.S.C. 348) is amended in the second proviso by striking “That” and inserting “That, subject to section 8(b) of the American Indian Probate Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-374; 118 Stat. 1810),”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Section 8 of the American Indian Probate Reform Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 2201 note; 118 Stat. 1809) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this Act apply on and after the date that is 1 year after the date on which the Secretary makes the certification required under subsection (a)(4).

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The following provisions of law apply as of the date of enactment of this Act:

“(A) Subsections (e) and (f) of section 207 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2206) (as amended by this Act).

“(B) Subsection (g) of section 207 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act (25 U.S.C. 2206) (as in effect on March 1, 2006).

“(C) The amendments made by section 4, section 5, paragraphs (1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11) of section 6(a), section 6(b)(3), and section 7 of this Act.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the American Indian Probate Reform Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-374; 118 Stat. 1773).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3351 addresses a number of minor, non-controversial tribal issues in one legislative package. H.R. 3351 contains 10 provisions to assist tribes with matters that are relatively small in nature but very important to Native Americans across our country.

Specifically, this legislation will make technical corrections to laws relating to Native Americans and Alaska Natives by reauthorizing certain Native American programs, clarifying statutes relating to particular Indian tribes and approving 99-year land leases for certain tribal lands.

The Senate amendment adds four provisions to the previous House-passed bill. The substitute adjusts the interest formula for the Fallon Paiute Shoshone tribal water settlement trust fund, increases the funding formula for the National Indian Gaming Commission, certifies rental proceeds for Indian-leased land and makes technical corrections to clarify provisions and amendments in the American Indian Probate Reform Act of 2004.

Each year, Congress passes a bill like this relating to technical corrections, and thankfully we have been able to utilize the consultation of many tribal leaders in examining this legislation.

I would like to thank Senator MCCAIN, chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, for working with our committee to craft a bipartisan and effective piece of legislation that will make a world of difference to the Native American community. I ask support for the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as the majority has stated, this noncontroversial bill makes technical amendments to a variety of laws relating to Native Americans and Alaska Natives. The House passed H.R. 3351 last year on the suspension calendar, and the legislation now before us reflects changes made by the Senate. I urge all of our colleagues to support passage of H.R. 3351.

Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time and urge Members to support the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3351.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALT CEDAR AND RUSSIAN OLIVE CONTROL DEMONSTRATION ACT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2720) to further the purposes of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 by directing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to carry out an assessment and demonstration program to control salt cedar and Russian olive, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2720

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Salt Cedar and Russian Olive Control Demonstration Act".

SEC. 2. SALT CEDAR AND RUSSIAN OLIVE CONTROL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the United States Geological Survey and in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense, shall carry out a salt cedar (*Tamarix* spp) and Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*) assessment and demonstration program—

(1) to assess the extent of the infestation by salt cedar and Russian olive trees in the western United States;

(2) to demonstrate strategic solutions for—
(A) the long-term management of salt cedar and Russian olive trees; and

(B) the reestablishment of native vegetation; and

(3) to assess economic means to dispose of biomass created as a result of removal of salt cedar and Russian olive trees.

(b) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into a memorandum of understanding providing for the administration of the program established under subsection (a).

(c) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall complete an assessment of the extent of salt cedar and Russian olive infestation on public and private land in the western United States.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In addition to describing the acreage of and severity of infestation by salt cedar and Russian olive trees in the western United States, the assessment shall—

(A) consider existing research on methods to control salt cedar and Russian olive trees;

(B) consider the feasibility of reducing water consumption by salt cedar and Russian olive trees;

(C) consider methods of and challenges associated with the revegetation or restoration of infested land; and

(D) estimate the costs of destruction of salt cedar and Russian olive trees, related biomass removal, and revegetation or restoration and maintenance of the infested land.

(3) REPORT.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report that includes the results of the assessment conducted under paragraph (1).

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall identify—

(i) long-term management and funding strategies identified under subsection (d) that could be implemented by Federal, State, tribal, and private land managers and owners to address the infestation by salt cedar and Russian olive;

(ii) any deficiencies in the assessment or areas for additional study; and

(iii) any field demonstrations that would be useful in the effort to control salt cedar and Russian olive.

(d) LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall identify and document long-term management and funding strategies that—

(A) could be implemented by Federal, State, tribal, and private land managers in addressing infestation by salt cedar and Russian olive trees; and

(B) should be tested as components of demonstration projects under subsection (e).

(2) GRANTS.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may provide grants to eligible entities to provide technical experience, support, and recommendations relating to the identification and documentation of long-term management and funding strategies under paragraph (1).

(B) **ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.**—Institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations with an established background and expertise in the public policy issues associated with the control of salt cedar and Russian olive trees shall be eligible for a grant under subparagraph (A).

(C) **MINIMUM AMOUNT.**—The amount of a grant provided under subparagraph (A) shall be not less than \$250,000.

(e) DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program that selects and funds not less than 5 projects proposed by and implemented in collaboration with Federal agencies, units of State and local government, national laboratories, Indian tribes, institutions of higher education, individuals, organizations, or soil and water conservation districts to demonstrate and evaluate the most effective methods of controlling salt cedar and Russian olive trees.

(2) **PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.**—The demonstration projects under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be carried out over a time period and to a scale designed to fully assess long-term management strategies;

(B) implement salt cedar or Russian olive tree control using 1 or more methods for each project in order to assess the full range of control methods, including—

(i) airborne application of herbicides;

(ii) biomechanical removal; and

(iii) biocontrol methods, such as the use of goats or insects;

(C) individually or in conjunction with other demonstration projects, assess the effects of and obstacles to combining multiple control methods and determine optimal combinations of control methods;

(D) assess soil conditions resulting from salt cedar and Russian olive tree infestation and means to revitalize soils;

(E) define and implement appropriate final vegetative states and optimal revegetation methods, with preference for self-maintaining vegetative states and native vegetation, and taking into consideration downstream impacts, wildfire potential, and water savings;

(F) identify methods for preventing the regrowth and reintroduction of salt cedar and Russian olive trees;

(G) monitor and document any water savings from the control of salt cedar and Russian olive trees, including impacts to both groundwater and surface water;

(H) assess wildfire activity and management strategies;

(I) assess changes in wildlife habitat;

(J) determine conditions under which removal of biomass is appropriate (including optimal methods for the disposal or use of biomass); and

(K) assess economic and other impacts associated with control methods and the restoration and maintenance of land.

(f) DISPOSITION OF BIOMASS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall complete an analysis of economic means to use or dispose of biomass created as a result of removal of salt cedar and Russian olive trees.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The analysis shall—

(A) determine conditions under which removal of biomass is economically viable;

(B) consider and build upon existing research by the Department of Agriculture and other agencies on beneficial uses of salt cedar and Russian olive tree fiber; and

(C) consider economic development opportunities, including manufacture of wood products using biomass resulting from demonstration projects under subsection (e) as a means of defraying costs of control.

(g) COSTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to projects and activities carried out under this Act—

(A) the assessment under subsection (c) shall be carried out at a cost of not more than \$4,000,000;

(B) the identification and documentation of long-term management strategies under subsection (d)(1) and the provision of grants under subsection (d)(2) shall be carried out at a cost of not more than \$2,000,000;

(C) each demonstration project under subsection (e) shall be carried out at a Federal cost of not more than \$7,000,000 (including costs of planning, design, implementation, maintenance, and monitoring); and

(D) the analysis under subsection (f) shall be carried out at a cost of not more than \$3,000,000.

(2) COST-SHARING.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The assessment under subsection (c), the identification and documentation of long-term management strategies under subsection (d), a demonstration project or portion of a demonstration project under subsection (e) that is carried out on Federal land, and the analysis under subsection (f) shall be carried out at full Federal expense.

(B) **DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS CARRIED OUT ON NON-FEDERAL LAND.**—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the costs of any demonstration project funded under subsection (e) that is not carried out on Federal land shall not exceed 75 percent.

(ii) FORM OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the costs of a demonstration project that is not carried out on Federal land may be provided in the form of in-kind contributions, including services provided by a State agency or any other public or private partner.

(h) COOPERATION.—In carrying out the assessment under subsection (c), the demonstration projects under subsection (e), and the analysis under subsection (f), the Secretary shall cooperate with and use the expertise of Federal agencies and the other entities specified in subsection (e)(1) that are actively conducting research on or implementing salt cedar and Russian olive tree control activities.

(i) INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—The Secretary shall subject to independent review—

(1) the assessment under subsection (c);

(2) the identification and documentation of long-term management strategies under subsection (d);

(3) the demonstration projects under subsection (e); and

(4) the analysis under subsection (f).

(j) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the results of carrying out this Act, including a synopsis of any independent review under subsection (i) and details of the manner and purposes for which funds are expended.

(2) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Secretary shall facilitate public access to all information that results from carrying out this Act.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

(A) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; and

(B) \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 15 percent of amounts made available under paragraph (1) shall be used to pay the administrative costs of carrying out the program established under subsection (a).

(l) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—This Act and the authority provided by this Act terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2720 would further the purposes of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 by directing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out assessment and demonstration programs to control salt cedar and Russian olive.

Salt cedar and Russian olive are small, deciduous harmful trees widely

distributed along riparian areas in the Western United States, particularly along the Colorado, Rio Grande, Pecos and Gila Rivers. They are known both for their phenomenal reproductive output and their ability to deplete scarce water resources. According to experts, one salt cedar tree can absorb 300 gallons a day. In fact, studies have shown that salt cedar dries up 800 billion gallons more water per year than the native cottonwood tree that it is replacing. Given these facts, most can agree that controlling salt cedar and Russian olive is important for water salvage, riparian restoration, salinity control, wildfire control and habitat restoration.

H.R. 2720 will begin to address these problems by providing sound science and in turn developing and expanding on innovative approaches to control these harmful weeds. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may control.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me congratulate my fellow New Mexican, Representative STEVE PEARCE, for his leadership on this issue. I am also proud to be a cosponsor of his legislation.

H.R. 2720 creates a research program to control two invasive shrubs: the salt cedar and the Russian olive. Introduced in the 19th century, both the salt cedar and the Russian olive flourish in a variety of soil types and tolerate shade well. Unfortunately, these invasive plants have invaded many streams across the West, forcing out native cottonwoods. Because the salt cedar and Russian olive utilize more water than native plants, their presence along streams is disrupting to water flow and water availability. H.R. 2720 will create both research and pilot programs to study effective control and long-term management of these shrubs. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2720.

I would also like to recognize my colleagues Representative MARK UDALL, Representative JOHN SALAZAR and Representative STEPHANIE HERSETH, who are all cosponsors of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we support H.R. 2720.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for his support for the bill and his hard work on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a hard-working member of the Agriculture Committee who has been a leader on invasive species issues, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR).

(Mr. SALAZAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both gentlemen from New Mexico.

I rise today in support of the Salt Cedar and Russian Olive Control Demonstration Act and urge swift passage of the measure. I would like to recognize Representative PEARCE and other cosponsors of the bill for their leadership in this desperately needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Southwestern United States is experiencing another severe drought and water is going to be in short supply again, as it has been in the last few years. This legislation will help to address our western water needs.

The salt cedar, or tamarisk plant, consumes large quantities of water, upwards of 200 gallons per day per plant. This is a non-native species that needs to be removed from our Nation's rivers and stream beds. It is estimated that these invasive plants occupy up to 1.6 million acres.

According to the Tamarisk Coalition of the Western United States, we are probably losing between 2 to 4.5 million acre feet of water per year. This would be enough water for 20 million people, or 1 million acres of irrigated farmland.

The tamarisk is a very difficult plant to control, and there are already efforts under way in Colorado and other Western States to control it. This legislation will help these folks by providing the necessary funding to look at better ways to control this species. By passing this bill, it will help Western States deal with drought concerns and continued growth. It benefits all water users in the West.

Just recently, the seven basin States of the Colorado River reached an agreement on how to manage the River. One section that the parties agreed upon was control of this invasive species. This bill will help these States meet their objectives.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is vital to the West, and I urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2720, the Salt Cedar and Russian Olive Control Demonstration Act.

Riparian lands in the western U.S. have been severely affected by many activities and actions, including the salt cedar plant. In my district and throughout much of the Rio Grande River Basin we are plagued with this invasive species.

This deciduous shrub or small tree from Eurasia has displaced native vegetation on approximately 1.6 million acres of land in the West and will continue to spread. Although salt cedar is the "poster child" of non-native plants impacting western rivers, other non-natives, such as Russian olive, cohabit with salt cedar and are important to control in order to restore riparian health.

Salt cedar thickets harm the surrounding environment by narrowing and channelizing streams and rivers; displacing native vegetation such as cottonwoods, willows, and adjacent dryland plant communities; providing poor habitat for livestock, wild animals, and birds;

increasing wildfire hazards; and limiting human use of the waterways.

While each of these points is important to one or more constituencies, the single most critical problem is that salt cedar steals water. The West may be losing 2 million to 4.5 million acre-feet of water per year due to the presence of salt cedar, which is beyond what native plants would likely use. The water needs of 20 million people or one million acres of irrigated farmland could be met with that amount of water.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2720 would address this problem by requiring the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, in association with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Defense, to create and deploy an assessment and demonstration program for salt cedar and Russian olive.

This program would first assess the extent of the infestation of both species in the western U.S., develop and demonstrate strategic solutions for long-term management and funding strategies of salt cedar and Russian olive and the reestablishment of native vegetation, and assess the economic means to dispose of biomass created as a result of removal of salt cedar and Russian olive trees.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2720 is essential to dealing with the salt cedar and Russian olive problem in the West, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this much-needed legislation.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, again I express my appreciation to Mr. UDALL from New Mexico for his hard work and support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time, requesting all Members to support H.R. 2720.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2720.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1515

DANA POINT DESALINATION PROJECT AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3929) to amend the Water Desalination Act of 1996 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist in research and development, environmental and feasibility studies, and preliminary engineering for the Municipal Water District of Orange County, California, Dana Point Desalination Project located at Dana Point, California, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3929

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Dana Point Desalination Project Authorization Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR DANA POINT DESALINATION PROJECT.

The Water Desalination Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 10301 note; Public Law 104-298) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 10. DANA POINT DESALINATION RESEARCH AND FEASIBILITY RELATED COSTS.

"(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may assist in research and development, environmental and feasibility studies, and preliminary engineering for the Municipal Water District of Orange County, California, Dana Point Desalination Project located at Dana Point, California.

"(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding section 7, the Federal share of the costs for the project assisted under subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total costs of the project.

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$2,500,000 to carry out this section.

"(d) SUNSET.—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of the enactment of this section."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3929, introduced by our distinguished colleague, KEN CALVERT, authorizes Federal participation in a unique desalination research and development project in Southern California.

Water consumers in that area of the State depend on imported water, and local efforts are being undertaken to develop nearby water supplies to reduce this dependence.

Desalination and water recycling are some of the most important ways to create new local water supplies. This legislation provides limited Federal assistance to develop a unique subsurface ocean water collection system that can reduce desalination's cost and eliminate impacts on the environment.

This project will not only help Southern California, but could also be a model for future desalination operations nationwide. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, we support passage of H.R. 3929. We need to do more, not less, to help communities that are working to apply new technologies to their water supply problems. This bill provides limited financial assistance for engineering and environmental studies. It does not authorize funds for construction.

The project sponsors are exploring the feasibility of an ocean water desalination plant using subsurface intake wells, which are protective of the marine environment. If this design is successful, it could encourage other coastal communities that are considering ocean desalination as a way to stretch their limited water supplies without causing damage to marine life.

It is unfortunate that the Bush administration opposes this bill. Their opposition to H.R. 3929 is short-sighted and ill advised. This administration appears to be on a crusade against the use of innovative technologies to help solve water supply problems.

I hope the bill will be enacted despite their objections.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have some familiarity with the project, since it is located in the district which I have the privilege to represent. Water is an issue. It is an issue in the West; it is an issue in California.

We will probably be dealing this week and over the next few weeks and perhaps months with some of the issues of a shortage of various energy projects. We can avoid shortages in water if we work on it early, if we get on some of these projects now.

What this project does, as both the previous speakers indicated, is it is not just something that is good for the district I represent or the area I represent, but is in fact a test project for this new type of desalination, where you are getting the water, rather than directly out of the ocean on the coast, you are actually bringing the water out underneath the sand, and then back to a desalination plant, which is off the coast.

That is why it does not have the negative environmental impacts putting a plant directly on the coast right against the water would be. But, also, the sand itself has the effect, we believe, of filtering this water on its way to the desalination plant, which both reduces the cost, reduces the waste that is created in desalination, and possibly, we believe, makes the project considerably more efficient and therefore cheaper.

So what this project, if it is successful, will do is it will create desalination that will be both less impactful on the environment, result in a higher

yield of usable water, and be cheaper along the way. So something that is good for all sides.

The Federal involvement here would only be 25 percent of the entire project, as 75 percent of the cost is being carried by local public agencies. So I appreciate the support on both sides of the aisle for this project and would urge its passage.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3929, the Dana Point Desalination Project Authorization Act. My legislation will authorize Federal participation in a relatively small ocean desalination project that could have an enormous impact on the future development of desalination projects.

As our country continues to look for new sources of water, particularly in the West, the expansion of our desalinated ocean water capability is essential. While extensively utilized in other parts of the world, most notably in the Middle East, the U.S. has only recently begun to consider large-scale ocean water desalination projects. There are a number of factors that have limited the viability of desalination projects. The major issues confronting ocean desalination are the cost of producing potable water and the potential negative impacts on ocean ecosystems.

The Dana Point Desalination Project is not a typical ocean desalination project. The project will use a unique subsurface ocean intake system that will collect water that naturally seeps through the ocean floor. The system provides a number of benefits over traditional intake systems, including removing the negative impacts on marine life as well as potentially reducing the need for extensive pretreatment filtration. If constructed and successful, the system would remove various concerns expressed by environmental advocates as well as improve the feasibility of future ocean desalination projects.

The Dana Point Desalination Project, to the best of my knowledge, is the only ocean desalination project supported by the Surfrider Foundation. Their support is a direct result of the unique subsurface intake technology that avoids negative impacts to the marine ecosystem. I would like to submit a letter from the Surfrider Foundation detailing their support for the Dana Point project for the record.

The Dana Point Desalination Project could have significant regional and national benefits. H.R. 3929 simply authorizes Federal participation in the project and limits the Federal obligation to \$2.5 million to assist with preliminary engineering and environmental studies. No construction dollars are authorized in H.R. 3929.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the Dana Point Desalination Project and passing H.R. 3929.

SURFRIDER FOUNDATION,

January 10, 2006.

Re Support for MWDOK Beach Well Feasibility Study.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I am writing on behalf of the Surfrider Foundation in support of efforts by the Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOK) to investigate the feasibility of sub-surface beach wells to supply seawater for ocean desalination.

The Surfrider Foundation is a non-profit environmental organization dedicated to the protection and enjoyment of the world's oceans, waves and beaches for all people,

through conservation, activism, research and education.

In general, Surfrider Foundation believes that future demands for water supplies should first be met by fully utilizing water conservation, wastewater reclamation, and stormwater management that will capture runoff for beneficial uses. We feel very strongly that these supply alternatives combine the benefit of meeting our future water needs while simultaneously reducing polluted runoff and ocean discharges. Ocean desalination should be the lowest priority for water supply choices and only employed using the most environmentally protective methods and technology.

We are pleased to see this approach to water supply alternatives reflected in MWDOK's 2005 Urban Water Management Plan. Furthermore, we are very supportive of the measured approach MWDOK is taking toward filling a limited role for ocean desalination in their water supply portfolio. Sub-surface "feedwater" intakes for desalination will avoid the unnecessary destruction of marine life, and disruption of healthy marine ecosystems, that accompanies open ocean intakes.

We look forward to the results of the sub-surface beach well feasibility study MWDOK is proposing in Dana Point.

Sincerely,

JOE GEEVER,

Southern California Regional Manager.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers and yield back the balance of my time and urge passage of H.R. 3929.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3929, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL TEXAS WATER RECYCLING ACT OF 2006

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3418) to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Central Texas Water Recycling and Reuse Project, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3418

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Central Texas Water Recycling Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (Public Law 102-575; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

"SEC. 16. CENTRAL TEXAS WATER RECYCLING AND REUSE PROJECT.

"(a) *AUTHORIZATION.*—The Secretary, in cooperation with the City of Waco and other par-

ticipating communities in the Central Texas Water Recycling and Reuse Project is authorized to participate in the design, planning, and construction of permanent facilities to reclaim and reuse water in McLennan County, Texas.

"(b) *COST SHARE.*—The Federal share of the costs of the project described in subsection (a) shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost.

"(c) *LIMITATION.*—The Secretary shall not provide funds for the operation and maintenance of the project described in subsection (a).

"(d) *SUNSET OF AUTHORITY.*—The authority of the Secretary to carry out any provisions of this section shall terminate 10 years after the date of enactment of this section."

(b) *CLERICAL AMENDMENT.*—The table of sections in section 2 of Public Law 102-575 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16 the following:

"Sec. 16. Central Texas Water Recycling and Reuse Project."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3418, introduced by Congressman CHET EDWARDS, authorizes Federal participation in a water reuse project in McLennan County, Texas. As central Texas cities experience rapid population growth and increased water demand, these communities are being proactive to better utilize their existing water supplies.

This legislation is part of the effort to create new water supplies. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, we support passage of H.R. 3418. We commend Congressman CHET EDWARDS for his persistence and hard work to secure authorization for this important project. The city of Waco is keenly aware that additional sources of water will be required to meet future water demands.

The city has decided to meet the expected water supply shortfall in part by implementing aggressive water conservation and water recycling and reclamation programs. The water recycling project identified in this bill will be eligible for limited financial assistance under the Bureau of Reclamation's title XVI water recycling program.

Water recycling and desalinization projects are proven technologies that can help stretch limited water supplies in areas such as Texas and the West.

I want to express our full support for this legislation. I offer my congratulations to Congressman EDWARDS for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the hard-working Member from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), who works tirelessly for his district.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. UDALL for his kind comments, and both Mr. UDALL and Mr. PEARCE for their excellent floor management of all of these bills today.

Mr. Speaker, our communities and Nation have a responsibility to be good stewards of our water resources. That is why I introduced H.R. 3418, the Central Texas Water Recycling Act of 2006. This bill will authorize Federal matching funds, 25 percent Federal, 75 percent local, to help build an innovative water recycling program partnership in my home town of Waco, Texas, and several neighboring communities in McLennan County.

Instead of wasting valuable drinking water for use in factories and on golf courses, we will be able to use lower-cost recycled wastewater for those purposes and save enough drinking water for 20,000 family households in McLennan County. The bottom line is this: being good stewards of our water supply, we will reduce water costs for businesses, save central Texas taxpayers millions of dollars, encourage economic growth in our area, and improve water quality in our central Texas rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman POMBO and ranking member RAHALL for their support of this measure, and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. RADANOVICH, the ranking subcommittee member, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for their key role in this bill's passage. This is the kind of bipartisan effort that shows what Congress can accomplish when we work together on a bipartisan basis.

I also want to thank the mayor, city council, and staff in the cities of Waco, Lorena, Robinson, Hewitt, Woodway, Bellmead and Lacy-Lakeview for their cooperative efforts that made this bill's passage possible.

Finally, I want to extend special credit to the city of Waco, my hometown, to its city manager, Larry Groth, for his extraordinary leadership on this bill. Without his leadership, hard work and professionalism, we would not be here today. And as a citizen of Waco, I am grateful for his outstanding service to my hometown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge bipartisan passage of H.R. 3418.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to my colleagues, Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. UDALL, for their work on this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3418, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF ITALY UPON THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THE 2006 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 697) congratulating the people and Government of Italy, the Torino Olympic Organizing Committee, the International Olympic Committee, the United States Olympic Committee, the 2006 United States Olympic Team, and all international athletes upon the successful completion of the 2006 Olympic Winter Games in Turin, Italy, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 697

Whereas from February 17 to February 26, 2006, Turin, Italy, hosted the 2006 Olympic Winter Games;

Whereas this is the third time Italy has hosted the Olympic Games, with the prior Winter Games having been held in 1956 in Cortina d'Ampezzo and the Summer Games having been held in 1960 in Rome;

Whereas the people of Turin and the surrounding Alpine areas have opened their hearts to the world, demonstrated their passions for sports, art, and culture, and strengthened the bonds between the city of Turin and the surrounding Alpine areas;

Whereas the city of Turin accommodated nearly 2,600 athletes, more than 2,700 trainers and escorts, 18,000 volunteers, 9,500 members of the media, and nearly 1,000,000 spectators at 7 competition sites and 3 Olympic villages;

Whereas in light of a global terror threat, Italian authorities implemented extraordinary security measures and successfully coordinated the efforts of 10,000 police officers and 2,500 Italian military personnel, providing effective and efficient protection, while also ensuring a secure and stable environment for both athletes and spectators alike;

Whereas through the stewardship of the International Olympic Committee and the Torino Olympic Organizing Committee, athletes representing 80 different countries competed in 15 disciplines of winter sport with the spirit of mutual respect and understanding, furthering the Olympic legacy of "peace between nations, equality, fair play, loyalty and respect";

Whereas well over 200 members of the United States Olympic Team participated in the Games and embodied the spirit of this Nation with resolve and determination and won 25 medals, including 9 gold medals;

Whereas 477 athletes from 39 countries competed for 9 days in March 2006 in Turin

at the 2006 Paralympic Winter Games, which were organized in 1948 as a venue for injured World War II veterans to compete, demonstrating not an individual's disability, but rather the individual's achievements in athleticism; and

Whereas the United States Olympic Team ranked second among all nations in the number of medals won at the 2006 Olympic Winter Games and the United States Paralympic Team ranked seventh among all nations in the number of medals won at the 2006 Paralympic Winter Games: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the people and Government of Italy, and specifically the people of Turin and the surrounding Alpine areas, the Torino Olympic Organizing Committee, and the International Olympic Committee on the successful completion of the 2006 Olympic Winter Games;

(2) congratulates the United States Olympic Committee, the 2006 United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams, and all international athletes for their outstanding performances at the 2006 Olympic Winter Games; and

(3) expresses gratitude to the thousands of volunteers and others who made the 2006 Olympic Winter Games exciting, safe, and successful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request my colleagues' support of House Resolution 697, a resolution congratulating the people and the Government of Italy, the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams, and other individuals and committees from around the world on the successful completion of the 20th Winter Olympic Games, which were held in Turin, Italy.

"Passion Lives Here" was the slogan for the Italian Winter Games. The world watched the Games from the opening to the closing ceremonies and witnessed the emotion of the event that stems from thousands of athletes and trainers from every corner of the globe participating in a competition that knows no border or political dispute.

For North and South Korea to march together for the first time during a Winter Olympics opening ceremony, although these two countries are still technically at war, the hope for continued progress toward peace among many differing nations was clearly evident.

This is what the spirit of the Olympics means for all of us for a few short

weeks every 4 years. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, since September 11, the entire world has been transformed. Now, unprecedented levels of security are required to protect Olympic athletes and their teams from attacks.

After all, the Olympic Games were once the target of horrifying attacks on athletes by terrorists. This resolution commends our good friends and allies, the people and Government of Italy, for their extraordinary efforts in protecting the world's athletes during these games.

□ 1530

To implement such an extraordinary security measure while also ensuring the fun, passionate Olympic environment is something not many countries can do with such successful orchestration.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Olympic Committee and team should also be congratulated for winning 25 medals during these Winter Games, nine of them gold, second only to the team's record for the number of medals won at the Winter Games that was set during the Salt Lake City games; and the United States Paralympic team ranks seventh among all nations in the number of medals won during the Paralympic Winter Games.

I would like to extend heartfelt congratulations to each of our medal winners who shall forever make the United States proud.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

I would first like to thank my good friend and colleague, Chairman HENRY HYDE, for sponsoring this measure.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, Italy hosted the winter Olympic Games in Torino. We want to congratulate the people and the government of Italy for the great success of these games.

The Torino Olympic Committee, the International Olympic Committee, and the United States Olympic Committee should be commended for these games, which were effectively and successfully organized and implemented.

The slogan of the games, Mr. Speaker, was "Passion Lives Here," which was certainly an accurate depiction of the enthusiasm, passion and pride the Italian people have not only for sports but also for their wonderful culture and heritage. The welcoming attitude they displayed to citizens of over 80 nations of the world who sent Olympic athletes and guests was outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend those involved with the security aspect of the games. As we all know, this kind of world gathering unfortunately presents potential terrorist opportunities. The Italian government and security officials performed magnificently. The venue was stable and secure for athletes, officials and spectators.

These games have many memorable moments and many new records were made, but, for me, the highlight of the Torino Winter Games came when a 26-year-old American speed skater, Joey Cheek, announced that he would donate his \$40,000 in bonus money to an organization called Right to Play, which helps children in poverty-stricken, war-torn countries in Africa. Joey also encouraged Olympic sponsors to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, Joey did not stop there. Just 2 days ago, tens of thousands of us rallied on the National Mall to call attention to the sickening and outrageous genocide occurring as we speak in Darfur, Sudan. It was my great pleasure to stand side by side with Joey Cheek at this rally where we both spoke to prod the international community not to forget the people of Darfur and to act to stop this genocide.

Joey Cheek's actions on behalf of the people of Africa, both at the Olympics and on the Mall, typify the true Olympic spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Italy for keeping this Olympic spirit alive. These Torino games rekindled the spirit for another 4 years. It is important that, just as we have seen in these Italian games, the Olympics best demonstrate the spirit of competition and the spirit of selflessness that Joey Cheek and other athletes have typified.

This was the third time Italy has hosted the Olympic games, and judging by the welcoming attitude and success of the Torino games, we look forward to future Olympic events in Italy.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 697, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING 58TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 392) recognizing the 58th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 392

Whereas on May 14, 1948, the State of Israel was established as a sovereign and independent nation;

Whereas the United States was one of the first nations to recognize Israel, only 11 minutes after its creation;

Whereas Israel has provided the opportunity for Jews from all over the world to reestablish their ancient homeland;

Whereas Israel is home to many religious sites which are sacred to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam;

Whereas Israel provided a refuge to Jews who survived the horrors of the Holocaust, which were unprecedented in human history;

Whereas the people of Israel have established a unique, pluralistic democracy which includes the freedoms cherished by the people of the United States, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom of the press, and government by the consent of the governed;

Whereas Israel continues to serve as a shining model of democratic values by regularly holding free and fair elections, promoting the free exchange of ideas, and vigorously exercising in its Parliament, the Knesset, a democratic government that is fully representative of its citizens;

Whereas Israel has bravely defended itself from terrorist and military attacks repeatedly since independence;

Whereas the Government of Israel has successfully worked with the neighboring Governments of Egypt and Jordan to establish peaceful, bilateral relations;

Whereas despite the deaths of over 1,000 innocent Israelis at the hands of murderous, suicide bombers and other terrorists during the past five years, the people of Israel continue to seek peace with their Palestinian neighbors;

Whereas visionary Israeli leaders like Yitzhak Rabin and Ariel Sharon were at the forefront of creating conditions for peace in the Middle East;

Whereas the United States and Israel enjoy a strategic partnership based on shared democratic values, friendship, and respect;

Whereas the people of the United States share an affinity with the people of Israel and view Israel as a strong and trusted ally;

Whereas Israel has made significant global contributions in the fields of science, medicine, and technology; and

Whereas Israel's Independence Day on the Jewish calendar coincides this year with May 3, 2006: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the independence of the State of Israel as a significant event in providing refuge and a national homeland for the Jewish people;

(2) commends the bipartisan commitment of all United States administrations and United States Congresses since 1948 to stand by Israel and work for its security and well-being;

(3) congratulates the United States and Israel for the strengthening of bilateral relations in the past year in the fields of defense, diplomacy, and homeland security and encourages both nations to continue their cooperation in resolving future mutual challenges; and

(4) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Israel as they celebrate the 58th anniversary of Israel's independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This week, we commemorate Israel's Independence Day. Israel's Independence Day comes just days after the Holocaust Remembrance Day, a date set aside for recalling the victims of the Holocaust and for contemplating what can happen to a civilized people when bigotry, hatred and indifference reign.

Following on the heels of the Holocaust Remembrance Day, the commemoration of Israeli Independence is a salute to and a celebration of Jewish perseverance and endurance, of the strength of character of the Jewish people.

On this day, we honor the great people of Israel, who are in constant struggle to safeguard their nation and ensure their survival amidst military attacks from hostile neighbors and prolonged terrorist campaigns.

Throughout its short history, Israelis have fought against incredible odds to reestablish the birthplace of the Jewish people.

Israel has been in a state of war for 58 years, commencing the moment that Israeli independence was declared by David Ben-Gurion. Yet, even at war, Israel's democracy and its vibrant, diverse and free society have remained strong. As democracies and freedom-loving nations, we stand side by side against oppression, terrorism, hatred and intolerance.

Today, Israel is a strong and prosperous nation. Its economy is thriving, and it has been a world leader in scientific discoveries.

The Israeli government has taken unprecedented steps in the past year to reach a peaceful resolution of their conflict with the Palestinians. Prime Minister Ariel Sharon implemented his plan to withdraw from the Gaza Strip. Yet Israel still finds itself without a partner for peace, as the Hamas-led PA has shown that they continue to support acts of terrorism against innocent Israeli civilians.

Today, as the State of Israel marks its 58th anniversary, we pay tribute to the strong bonds of friendship between the United States and Israel, and we reiterate our commitment to its security and its stability.

The United States will never waiver. We will never falter in our support for the State of Israel.

We look forward to a date soon when we can celebrate an independent Israeli

Jewish State that exists in peace and security and no longer has to fear for its very survival. I hope that all Americans will join us in extending our best wishes and congratulations to the Israeli people and to the Jewish nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and I rise in strong support of this resolution.

The resolution before the House expresses Members' heartfelt congratulations to the Israeli people in recognition of the 58th anniversary of their independence, which they will celebrate tomorrow. I strongly commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), my colleague, for bringing this resolution before the House.

The story of Israel's independence is no less inspirational simply because it is well known. It represents a remarkable triumph of the human spirit.

Today, the day before its Independence Day, Israel memorialized its thousands of fallen soldiers, who themselves silently testify to the sacrifice with which Israel won and has perfected its independence and freedom.

Although Israelis have been relentlessly under attack since their nation's birth, they have succeeded in creating one of the most democratic, prosperous, technologically advanced and humane societies on earth.

Mr. Speaker, Israel celebrates its anniversary this year after having unilaterally withdrawn its troops and settlements from Gaza. This was done under the courageous leadership of Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and marked only the most recent testimony of Israel's singular willingness to take risks to achieve peace.

Now, a new prime minister, Ehud Olmert, has taken office. He, too, has bold ideas about how to achieve peace. I know him well, and I know he is more than up to the task. We congratulate him on his electoral victory. We look forward to working with him, and we wish him every success in his endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of the State of Israel has been a great boon not only for those who live in Israel but for our Nation as well. We treasure Israel as our most loyal ally in the Middle East and as the embodiment of values we cherish.

The United States has played a critical role in supporting Israel's security. It has played that role in a bipartisan fashion. Congress has had a leading responsibility in shaping the structure and content of that support. Our support for Israel is an important contribution to, and a credit to, U.S. foreign policy, and we are proud of that support.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to do so.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for offering this important bipartisan resolution recognizing the 58th anniversary

of the independence of the State of Israel. And I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Throughout the last 58 years, Israel—an oasis of freedom in a sea of despair—has been vilified, threatened and attacked by those who seek her destruction. And yet, she has prevailed and prospered—just as she will prevail and prosper today, tomorrow and in the future.

Harry Truman made the United States the first nation to recognize the new State of Israel in 1948, just 11 minutes after its creation.

"I had faith in Israel before it was established, I have faith in it now," said President Truman. "I believe it has a glorious future before it—not just another sovereign nation, but as an embodiment of the great ideals of our civilization."

Israel's security and success is not only a strategic imperative for the United States. It is a moral imperative, as well. Ours is a relationship of shared values and common aspirations, and of principle and conscience.

We are nations of immigrants, safe havens for the oppressed and partners for peace. And, we are united in fighting terrorism.

No people on earth have been subjected to more bigotry and violence than the Jewish people, and no people are more in need of a sovereign, secure homeland to provide safe haven and to protect identity.

I have had the privilege of leading Congressional delegations on tours of Israel twice in the last three years. And, I can say with confidence that the special bond that exists between the United States and Israel is strong, growing stronger and will not break.

Last August, our Congressional delegation saw firsthand the pain caused by Israel's unilateral disengagement from Gaza—another bold step undertaken in the pursuit of peace and stability.

But more importantly, we saw a people deeply committed to the democratic process and the rule of law. What our Members saw was a reflection of themselves: People who love their country; people who want to live in peace and freedom; and people who want their children to have even greater opportunities.

Today, as our allies in Israel prepare to celebrate their 58th anniversary of independence, let us honor their determination to fulfill the vision of Zionism's founding father, Theodor Herzl, who observed, "If you will it, it is no dream."

Through courage and will, Israel was born and the dream of generations was made real—and it will endure.

I want to congratulate the citizens of Israel and the entire Jewish community on this 58th anniversary of Israel's founding.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join in support of House Concurrent Resolution 392 which I authored. In the wake of the Holocaust, the nation of Israel was established as a refuge for millions of Jews who survived horrendous crimes committed by the Nazis. Over the course of the next fifty-eight years, the people of Israel demonstrated the resiliency of the human spirit while overcoming tremendous obstacles. Their country now serves as a source of pride for the Jewish people and a strong partner in democracy with over 160 countries.

Today, by recognizing the independence of Israel, commending our country's support for

Israel, and encouraging our two countries to strengthen bilateral relations, Congress is clearly stating its confidence in the future of this great country. Israelis and Americans share mutual democratic values, and respect, and our countries are stronger when we work together. As citizens of both nations face similar enemies in the Global War on Terrorism, we must remain committed to a strong friendship which will protect both of our countries.

As the people of Israel celebrate their 58th year of independence, I am honored to extend my warmest congratulations on this inspiring achievement.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11th.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, Israel is one of the United States' greatest allies and I am proud to join my colleagues in recognizing it on the occasion of its 58th anniversary celebration of independence.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the U.S.-Israeli relationship is its mutual benefits. For 58 years the United States has assisted Israel diplomatically, financially and militarily, while Israel has proved itself to be a stalwart friend of democracy in a volatile region of the world. Particularly since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, Israel has not hesitated to provide technical assistance, intelligence and advice on matters of homeland security, on which it has become, out of necessity, an expert in its own right.

Although the history of the Land of Israel stretches back far longer than that of the United States, we share a common history as refuges to victims of persecution, and as nations that never balked to defend freedom, democracy and the inalienable rights of man.

The United States is proud of its alliance with Israel—a friendship that officially began 11 minutes after Israel's creation. I look forward to many great years of thoughtful exchange and the promotion of our common interests of world peace and prosperity. Congratulations to the people of Israel as they celebrate the 58th anniversary of their statehood.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 392, which celebrates the 58th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. Today, we remember and pay tribute to the creation of the democratic State of Israel. It took the United States only eleven minutes after Israel had been declared a state to officially welcome her into the community of nations. For the last 58 years the United States and Israel have built a unique special relationship.

The creation of the State of Israel was a bold step in May of 1948. The first Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, once said that, "courage is a special kind of knowledge: the knowledge of how to fear what ought to be feared and how not to fear what ought not to be feared." It is from such courage that the State of Israel was formed and from which Israel continues to maintain its vibrant and strong democracy today. We can all learn examples from the struggles that the citizens have endured and the grief they have overcome to remain a democratic outpost in the Middle East.

I am proud to join my colleagues today to reiterate our continued strong support of Israel and her right to defend herself and her people from terrorism, and to focus on the special relationship that exists between our two nations. I have had the pleasure of traveling to Israel

on a number of occasions, and these visits have only reinforced my strong conviction that the United States must remain actively engaged in ensuring a peaceful and equitable agreement between the two parties to the current conflict.

Yet, much work remains unfinished. We are all troubled by the recent Palestinian elections that put Hamsa in control of the Palestinian Authority and by the hateful, threatening comments that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has made about Israel. This year also brought a transition from Prime Minister Ariel Sharon to Ehud Olmert, and my thoughts and prayers remain with the Sharon family. This has been a unique year for Israel, full of challenges that were admirably met. As Ben-Gurion used to say, "in Israel, in order to be a realist you must believe in miracles." I still strongly believe in the dream that has become the wonderful reality of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution celebrating the 58 years of Israel's existence as a beacon of democracy and hope in the Middle East. I also celebrate today the daily courage exhibited by the citizens of Israel and express my personal commitment to Israel at this milestone in its history. I look forward to future anniversaries, and to the day when Israel and her citizens can live in peace without the need for courage against fear.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join in celebrating the anniversary of Israel's independence. Israel is one of America's closest allies. We rely on her good will in our War on Terror. We enjoy mutually beneficial economic agreements. And, we value Israel as the only functioning democracy in the world's most volatile region.

On May 14, 1948, or the fifth day of the month of Iyar, which is the Hebrew date of the formal establishment of the State, members of the "provisional government" read and signed a Declaration of Independence in Tel Aviv. After decades of no homeland, the State of Israel was finally returned to the Jewish people. This year will mark the 58th anniversary of "Yom Ha'atzmaut" or Independence Day.

Yom Ha'atzmaut in Israel is always preceded by Yom Hazikaron—Memorial Day for the Fallen Soldiers. The message of linking these two days is clear: Israelis owe their independence—the very existence of the State—to the soldiers who sacrificed their lives for it, a sentiment not lost on Americans.

The official transition from Yom Hazikaron to Yom Ha'atzmaut is a moving event that takes place a few minutes after sundown with a ceremony on Mount Herzl in Jerusalem in which the flag is raised from half staff to the top of the pole. The President of Israel delivers a speech of congratulations, and soldiers representing the army, navy, and air force parade with their flags.

I wish our good companion, Israel, safety and security, prosperity and good fortune over the upcoming year. I vow to continue standing with you and working to ensure that the friendship between our two great nations remains strong.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 58th birthday of the State of Israel. Israel is an important ally of the United States and like our great country, Israel was founded by people seeking freedom from religious persecution. This persecution came in the form of the Holocaust—one of the most heinous events in recent history.

The United States recognized Israel within 11 minutes of its creation as an independent nation; however, not all developments in Israel's infancy as a nation were welcome. Attacked in 1948 from all sides by surrounding Arab nations, Israel defeated its enemies but soon learned it would have to develop as a democratic nation while vigilantly patrolling its borders for foreign invaders.

In addition to being a picturesque country located on the Mediterranean Sea, Israel is home to many religious sites that are sacred to people of the Muslim, Christian and Jewish faith. This concentration of Holy sites makes it all the more unfortunate that Israel and its people are the targets of so many terrorist attacks.

Mr. Speaker, Israel and the United States have strong bilateral relations that I hope will continue to grow and strengthen in the years to come. I wish the people and the leaders of Israel best wishes, continued prosperity and a peaceful future.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution congratulating Israel on the occasion of its 58 years of independence.

On May 14, 1948, facing overwhelming odds and almost assured destruction by its Arab neighbors, Jews living in their ancestral homeland, survivors of the Holocaust and Jewish refugees from around the world gathered in a small room in Tel Aviv to announce the creation of the Jewish state of Israel. In the shadow of the murderous genocide of the Holocaust, the state of Israel was created so that Jews around the world would always have safe refuge from oppression and annihilation.

In 1948, years of Zionists' dreams culminated as David Ben Gurion announced to the world that once again Israel was to be a free and independent state, founded on principles of freedom and democracy, the new state of Israel was quickly recognized by the United States as a welcome ally in the Middle East. Unfortunately, within hours of this historic declaration, the neighboring Arab nations attacked and sent Israel into its first war as an independent nation. Despite conventional wisdom, and the great surprise of many around the world, Israel survived the attack but at a heavy cost to the young nation.

Today, 58 years after the creation of the state, Israel still struggles with an enemy who wishes to destroy it. In addition, just last January, the Palestinian people freely elected Hamas, a terrorist organization that strives for the destruction of the state of Israel, to run its government. Israel is a thriving democracy and one of the United States' strongest allies in the global war on terror. Israel has demonstrated to the world that democracy can thrive in the Middle East and that freedom of religion, freedom of the press and basic human rights can work in a region that is otherwise dominated by terror and oppression.

I stand today to congratulate Israel on its strong dedication to freedom and democracy throughout its 58 years of existence. I look forward to strengthening the U.S.-Israel relationship and continuing to celebrate Israel's independence in years to come.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 392, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONVEYING SYMPATHY OF CONGRESS TO FAMILIES OF YOUNG WOMEN MURDERED IN CHIHUAHUA, MEXICO

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) conveying the sympathy of Congress to the families of the young women murdered in the State of Chihuahua, Mexico, and encouraging increased United States involvement in bringing an end to these crimes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 90

Whereas the Mexican cities of Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua have been plagued with the abduction, sexual assault, and brutal murders of over 400 young women since 1993;

Whereas there have been at least 56 murders of women in Ciudad Juárez and the city of Chihuahua since 2004;

Whereas at least 152 of the victims were sexually assaulted prior to their murders;

Whereas more than half of the victims are women and girls between the ages of 13 and 22, and many were abducted in broad daylight in well-populated areas;

Whereas these murders have brought pain to the families and friends of the victims on both sides of the border as they struggle to cope with the loss of their loved ones;

Whereas many of the victims have yet to be positively identified;

Whereas the perpetrators of most of these heinous acts remain unknown;

Whereas the Mexican Federal Government has taken steps to prevent these abductions and murders in Ciudad Juárez, including setting up a commission to coordinate Federal and State efforts, establishing a 40-point plan, appointing a special commissioner, and appointing a special prosecutor;

Whereas the Mexican Federal special prosecutor's review of the Ciudad Juárez murder investigations found evidence that over 100 police, prosecutors, forensics experts, and other State of Chihuahua justice officials failed to properly investigate the crimes, and recommended that they be held accountable for their acts of negligence, abuse of authority, and omission;

Whereas the Government of Mexico has recognized the importance of the work of the Mexican Federal special prosecutor and has shifted the mission of the prosecutor's office to assist local authorities in investigating and prosecuting crimes of violence against women throughout the country;

Whereas in 2003 the El Paso Field Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the

El Paso Police Department began providing Mexican Federal, State, and municipal law enforcement authorities with training in investigation techniques and methods;

Whereas the United States Agency for International Development has begun providing assistance to the State of Chihuahua for judicial reform;

Whereas the government of the State of Chihuahua has jurisdiction over these crimes;

Whereas the Governor and Attorney General of the State of Chihuahua have expressed willingness to collaborate with the Mexican Federal Government and United States officials in addressing these crimes;

Whereas the Department of State has provided consular services on behalf of the American citizen and her husband who were tortured into confessing to one of the murders;

Whereas Mexico is a party to the following international treaties and declarations that relate to abductions and murders: the Charter of the Organization of American States, the American Convention on Human Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the United Nations Declaration on Violence Against Women, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention of Belem do Para, the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance, and the United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons From Enforced Disappearance; and

Whereas continuing impunity for these crimes is a threat to the rule of law in Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the ongoing abductions and murders of young women in Ciudad Juárez and the city of Chihuahua in the State of Chihuahua, Mexico, since 1993;

(2) expresses its sincerest condolences and deepest sympathy to the families of the victims of these murders;

(3) recognizes the courageous struggle of the victims' families in seeking justice for the victims;

(4) urges the President and Secretary of State to incorporate the investigative and preventative efforts of the Mexican Government in the bilateral agenda between the Governments of Mexico and the United States and to continue to express concern over these abductions and murders to the Government of Mexico;

(5) urges the President and Secretary of State to continue to express support for the efforts of the victims' families to seek justice for the victims, to express concern relating to the continued harassment of these families and the human rights defenders with whom they work, and to express concern with respect to impediments in the ability of the families to receive prompt and accurate information in their cases;

(6) supports ongoing efforts to identify unknown victims through forensic analysis, including DNA testing, conducted by independent, impartial experts who are sensitive to the special needs and concerns of the victims' families, as well as efforts to make these services available to any families who have doubts about the results of prior forensic testing;

(7) condemns the use of torture as a means of investigation into these crimes;

(8) encourages the Secretary of State to continue to include in the annual Country Report on Human Rights of the Department

of State all instances of improper investigatory methods, threats against human rights activists, and the use of torture with respect to cases involving the murder and abduction of young women in the State of Chihuahua;

(9) encourages the Secretary of State to urge the Government of Mexico and the State of Chihuahua to review the cases of murdered women in which those accused or convicted of murder have credibly alleged they were tortured or forced by a state agent to confess to the crime;

(10) strongly recommends that the United States Ambassador to Mexico visit Ciudad Juárez and the city of Chihuahua for the purpose of meeting with the families of the victims, women's rights organizations, and Mexican Federal and State officials responsible for investigating these crimes and preventing future such crimes;

(11) encourages the Secretary of State to urge the Government of Mexico to ensure fair and proper judicial proceedings for the individuals who are accused of these abductions and murders and to impose appropriate punishment for those individuals subsequently determined to be guilty of such crimes;

(12) encourages the Secretary of State to urge the State of Chihuahua to hold accountable those law enforcement officials whose failure to adequately investigate the murders, whether through negligence, omission, or abuse, has led to impunity for these crimes;

(13) encourages the Secretary of State to urge the Government of Mexico to ensure that the Mexican Federal special prosecutor's office, responsible for assisting local authorities in investigating and prosecuting crimes of violence against women throughout the country, gives particular attention to the murders of women in Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua City;

(14) strongly supports the work of the special commissioner to prevent violence against women in Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua City;

(15) condemns all senseless acts of violence in all parts of the world and, in particular, violence against women; and

(16) expresses the solidarity of the people of the United States with the people of Mexico in the face of these tragic and senseless acts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 90, introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

The resolution before us respectfully conveys to the families of more than 400 young women who have been murdered in the State of Chihuahua, Mexico, the deepest sympathy of the

United States Congress. It also encourages law enforcement in the United States to seek closer cooperation with Mexican law enforcement authorities to solve these crimes and bring the perpetrators to justice.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, the border with Mexico can be a violent place. With drug traffickers, migrant smugglers, and other violent malefactors operating along the border, young women who live and work in the many border communities often fall prey to these violent criminals.

Over the past 12 years, more than 400 murders and disappearances of women have been committed in the cities of Ciudad Juarez and Chihuahua City. Fifty-five women have been killed in Juarez and Chihuahua City since 2004 alone. Unfortunately, very few of these cases have been resolved and even fewer perpetrators of this violence have been caught and prosecuted. As a result, the violence continues.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 90 will hopefully bring much-needed attention to the brutal torture, rapes, and murders committed against women along the U.S.-Mexican border, especially in the State of Chihuahua, and will underscore the need for more cooperative law enforcement in both the United States and Mexico.

Before this resolution was introduced and brought to the floor, too little attention was paid to this important issue. Today, Congress is taking a stand and urging both the United States and Mexico to ensure its people, wherever they may live and work, that they will be secure within their homes and workplaces and that they can live without the fear of violence which is now sweeping our border communities.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we in Congress continue to encourage our governments to work with Mexico not only to protect the women in Juarez but also to thoroughly investigate these crimes and bring an end to these murders. House Concurrent Resolution 90 would serve as a call to action along the border and would be a constant reminder to both the United States and Mexico that we must do more to protect our citizens against criminal elements and cooperate more on bringing criminals to justice. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House introduced by my distinguished California colleague and good friend, Congresswoman HILDA SOLIS, shines the spotlight on the murders of impoverished young women in Mexico. I applaud my friend and colleague, Chairman HYDE, for recognizing the importance of this resolution and fa-

cilitating its consideration both by our committee and the full House.

Mr. Speaker, since 1993, over 400 gruesome killings have plagued Mexico's nearly lawless northern border. In the last 2 years alone, over 56 women in this region have had their lives brutally extinguished.

Although these statistics are shocking at face value, the numbers often hide due to time and distance the very human stories that bleed from the pages of crime reports. In the Ciudad Juarez murders, the tragic tales are about girls and young women in the prime of their lives who, as they are walking home from one of the many sweatshops along the border, are kidnapped, raped, and brutally murdered. Their bodies are then unceremoniously dumped at the fringes of town. Families are left wondering what happened to their daughters or sisters or mothers.

As a result of the combined efforts of honorable individuals like my good friends and colleagues, Congresswoman SOLIS and Congressman REYES, as well as organizations such as the Washington Office on Latin America and the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, the Mexican government of President Fox finally took action. Among President Fox's initiatives were the establishment of a commission to coordinate federal and state efforts in Mexico, the appointment of a special prosecutor to review and bring related cases, and a plan to prevent future crimes.

It is not yet clear, Mr. Speaker, that these efforts have slowed the pace by which girls and women are being murdered in Ciudad Juarez or in Chihuahua City. Credible reports indicate that at least as many murders have been committed each year since the Mexican federal and state authorities began implementing their new policies.

It is also not apparent that local authorities are seriously committed to investigating and bringing to justice the criminals who are behind the murders. Suspects have been arrested for only about half of the Ciudad Juarez murders. In a significant number of cases, the defendants claimed that they were tortured into confessing their guilt. Real, impartial, professional investigations and prosecutions are needed to take the killers off the streets and to bring closure to the victims' families.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today takes steps to address these remaining problems. It encourages the administration to include the Ciudad Juarez murders as part of the bilateral agenda between our government and the government of Mexico. It supports ongoing efforts to identify unknown victims through forensic analysis, including DNA testing, and it urges the Mexican authorities to invest in a new sense of urgency and professionalism as part of their continuing work.

These killings, Mr. Speaker, must stop. I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to my friend, Congressman ENGEL of New York, the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding to me; and as both a co-sponsor of this resolution and as ranking member of the House International Relations Subcommittee for the Western Hemisphere, I rise in strong support of this important resolution.

I want to thank and commend my colleague, Congresswoman SOLIS, for her leadership in raising attention to the dire problem in Ciudad Juarez and Chihuahua, Mexico. I also want to thank my friend, Congressman REYES, for highlighting this important issue as well.

In a congressional hearing last week, Mr. Speaker, on U.S.-Mexico relations, I directly called on senior U.S. Department of State officials to continue to press Mexican authorities on the approximately 400 women who had been brutally murdered in the Mexican cities of Ciudad Juarez and Chihuahua since 1993 and to provide U.S. assistance; and I remain deeply concerned over the killings of these young women. It is time that a serious effort was made to solve these terrible murders that are plaguing the towns in Ciudad Juarez and Chihuahua, and I hope that the U.S. State Department will take appropriate action to help Mexico address these heinous crimes, not only the crimes that have been committed but obviously we want to prevent any further crimes from being committed.

I continue to urge the American government to work with Mexican authorities to halt this brutal violence against Mexican women and to investigate these horrible crimes. How can we just sit by as hundreds of women are killed and sexually assaulted just across the Texas border? I condemn the ongoing abductions and murders of women in Ciudad Juarez and Chihuahua City and express my heartfelt condolences to the victims' families. We will continue to press this issue until it is resolved.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished author of the resolution and co-chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus, Ms. HILDA SOLIS of California.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my great thanks and honor to Congressman LANTOS and Congressman ENGEL and also to Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN for her support.

Mr. Speaker, we are strongly in support of this resolution to support the families of women who have been murdered in Ciudad Juarez and in the city of Chihuahua in Mexico. I have always believed that attacks on women are attacks on women everywhere.

This came to my attention some 4 years ago, and I was very proud to help lead a delegation for the first time, a House delegation to Ciudad Juárez, which is 5 minutes from our border, our frontier there. And what I found was a horrific, horrific problem, brutal murders of women, as was already stated by our colleagues. And to hear that over the past 13 years this had been allowed to continue without any involvement on the part of our government and Mexico, I felt compelled as a woman, as a Latina, as someone who felt very strongly that, if we are going to stand up for women's rights in other continents of the world and the Middle East to defend the Afghani women who are being tortured by the Taliban, why not then also come forward and support the women of Ciudad Juárez?

We know that there are well over 400 victims that have been brutally murdered; and recently just this past year we found that a young girl, 7 years old, was kidnapped, raped, and brutally murdered. Another girl just 10 years was raped, killed, and set on fire in her home. These children were taken away from us too soon, and the anguished families will never be the same.

When I took a delegation to Ciudad Juárez, we had the opportunity, along with other members of the House, to meet with the families, to meet with the mothers of the victims, and what they asked for was nothing more than respect and acknowledgement and hopefully the force of our offices to get both sides, the Mexican government as well as the U.S. government, to come to an agreement to recognize that these atrocities must stop, to recognize the valor and respect of these families, and help to provide some closure; and through this resolution I hope that we can begin to do that.

This poster here illustrates an area that we actually visited very close to a grave site where eight bodies were thrown. It was almost as though there was a message being sent to authorities in Mexico that this is how we treat people in Ciudad Juárez, and very little regard for the value of human life. As you can see in the picture, we had several individuals that went with us to visit there. We had Congressman REYES, we had at that time Congressman *Ciro Rodriguez*, Congressman *LUIS GUTIERREZ*, and we also had a good friend of mine who is depicted in the photograph, *Dolores Huerta*, who joined me.

But the value of that trip was to really meet and speak to the families, to speak to the mothers, to speak to the fathers who had recited their individual accounts of how they found their daughters and in what state they found their daughters or corpses. Yet we find today that we still have many remains that have not been identified, not because there is not a willingness to do it but because perhaps someone did not collect appropriate DNA information and tampered with perhaps evidence at the time so that you could not

then retrace who was actually involved in these criminal atrocities.

That, I hope, will come to an end with the passage of this resolution, that we can begin to work in all honesty to identify the remains that are still left unclaimed by the families and provide some resolution.

I am very, very pleased that I had the support of our caucuses and outside community groups that helped to support us in this effort. It has been a long journey, and I want to personally thank various groups that helped us along this way. I want to thank in particular our committee staff, *Paul Oostburg*, for helping us, the Washington Office on Latin America, the Latin America Working Group, and Amnesty International, and many others across the country who helped us to lay out the foundation for the final passage of this legislation that I hope we will find later this afternoon.

I would ask that the House join us in support of this resolution, and I look forward to seeing our friends and colleagues in the Senate also assist us with passage of their similar resolution that also outlines the same provisions in this resolution.

Today I rise to voice my strong support for the families of women who have been murdered in Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua City, Mexico.

I have always believed that attacks of women anywhere are attacks on women everywhere. That is why three years ago I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 90, a resolution to raise awareness, express concern and propose a set of actions to address the murders and disappearances of young women in Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua City, Mexico.

I was horrified by the brutal murders of women just five minutes beyond our border. Over the past 12 years, more than 400 women have been brutally assaulted and murdered in Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua City, and few of the perpetrators of this violence have been prosecuted or even found.

Women and young girls from all parts of Mexico moved to Ciudad Juárez in hopes of finding work, including jobs at American-owned maquiladoras.

These jobs involve late hours, forcing women to travel home in the dark, alone, leaving them vulnerable to attack.

Many of their bodies have been found in abandoned or desolate areas, showing signs of rape, torture and mutilation.

These acts are more than just crimes; they are horrific violations of women's rights and human rights.

Today, these crimes are not decreasing in frequency or brutality.

As an example, in 2005, a 7 year-old girl was kidnapped, raped and brutally murdered. Another girl, just 10 years old, was raped, killed and set on fire in her own home. These children were taken from us too soon, and their anguished families will never be the same.

While the men who murdered these particular children were caught, most of the victim's killers remain free and investigations of their cases have been minimal.

In 2001, the so-called "cotton field" murder victims were discovered in a Ciudad Juárez

cotton field. Eight women were found raped, mutilated, and killed.

This case exemplifies the brutality of violence in Ciudad Juárez.

Mexican officials tortured two men into confessing to the cotton field murders. Their convictions were later overturned. One of the men who was wrongly accused died in prison and the lawyers in the case were gunned down. And this horrific case remains unsolved.

This pattern of torturing innocent men into confessing has touched the community I represent.

In 2003, *Neyra Cervantes* disappeared near Chihuahua City, Mexico, and her cousin, *David Mesa*, lived in the Congressional District I represent.

Mesa traveled to Juárez to help investigate his cousin's disappearance. He was incarcerated for criticizing the efforts of local authorities and allegedly tortured into confessing to the murder of his cousin. *David* is still in prison for the murder of his cousin—a murder he did not commit.

We must end the violence against women in Ciudad Juárez and catch the real criminals who are murdering women, not make more victims by torturing innocent people into confessing. The women and families in Ciudad Juárez are living their daily lives in fear. We must bring more attention to these crimes and help end the violence.

House Concurrent Resolution 90, the resolution we will vote on today, expresses concern about the continuing injustices that are killing young women and affecting American families in our border cities.

This resolution urges the U.S. government to take action and commit to working with the Mexican government to end these tragedies.

It is important that we, in Congress, continue to push the United States to work with Mexico to not only protect women in Juárez, but also to thoroughly investigate these crimes and bring an end to the murders. These atrocities have real affects on victims' families.

In 2003 and 2004 I organized Congressional Delegation trips to Ciudad Juárez to meet with families of victims, Mexican government officials, and human rights groups.

The mothers of victims and their families are suffering at the loss of their family members and continue to suffer because of inaction of the Mexican government. It was on these trips that my dedication to helping the women of Juárez was solidified. I would like to thank the Members of Congress and activists who have traveled to Ciudad Juárez with me, including Congressman *LUIS GUTIERREZ*, Congressman *SILVESTRE REYES*, our former colleague, Congressman *Ciro Rodriguez*, Congresswoman *JAN SCHAKOWSKY*, and my friend, *Dolores Huerta*, cofounder of VFW.

I have hosted briefings to educate others about this issue, sent letters to the State Department and President Bush and even to Mexico's President *Vicente Fox* urging action to end the murders of women and give peace to their families.

Last year I was joined by Senator *JEFF BINGAMAN* of New Mexico, in securing \$200,000 from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to help fund a team of independent forensic experts from Argentina to work in Juárez identifying the unknown victims' remains and provide closure to their families.

These murders have caused incredible pain for the families of victims, compounded by the

lack of response from their police and local government.

For the first time, families of the missing will receive dependable, legitimate identifications of their daughters.

While changes have been made in local and state government and some answers are coming to light, we must continue to pressure Mexican authorities to investigate crimes and do more to end the violence.

As we move forward, we must push for thorough investigations, so the families have closure and so the streets are safer for all women and children.

We also need to ensure safer conditions for the women of Juárez, in their homes, communities and workplaces.

We must remember that no matter where it takes place, on either side of our border, a murder of any woman is a terrible tragedy.

As one, unified voice against violence and one, unified voice for justice, our strength is in our solidarity to find peace for the families of Juárez.

Ni una mas! means "Not one more!"

I would like to thank the 143 bipartisan cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 90.

I would like to thank Chairman HYDE, Ranking Member LANTOS, Subcommittee Chairman BURTON, and Subcommittee Ranking Member ENGEL for their continued support as we work to bring peace to Ciudad Juárez.

I would also like to thank Committee Staff Paul Oostburg for his assistance and advocates from organizations such as the Washington Office on Latin America, the Latin America Working Group and Amnesty International for their passion.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 90, and demonstrate our strong support for the families of victims in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico. And I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the fight for women's rights, human rights and an end to the violence.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. SILVESTRE REYES. His El Paso district is the sister community to Ciudad Juarez. He is Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Task Force on International Relations, and an invaluable colleague.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Chairman HENRY HYDE and Ranking Member TOM LANTOS, my good friend, for bringing this resolution to the floor today. Likewise, I would like to thank my colleague from Florida for handling the time on this very important issue.

□ 1600

I would also like to thank Ms. SOLIS for introducing H. Con. Res. 90, a resolution conveying sympathy to the families affected by the murder of young women in Chihuahua, Mexico, and encouraging the United States to be involved in bringing an end to these crimes.

As the representative of El Paso, Texas, the neighboring city to Ciudad Juarez, the issue of unsolved murders is of great concern to me and my constituents.

Since 1993, many women have been violently murdered in Chihuahua, Mexico, and many have yet to be positively identified. This leaves family members with more questions than answers about the fate of their loved ones. In the past, I have urged Mexican President Vicente Fox to launch a comprehensive investigation to help bring an end to these murders and to bring those responsible to justice. In addition, I hosted, as the Ms. SOLIS mentioned, a congressional delegation in El Paso and Ciudad Juarez so my colleagues, including Congresswoman SOLIS, could learn more about the subject and about the assistance needed in this region of Mexico.

In July of 2005, I offered an amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006-2007 to encourage the administration to raise the issue of murdered women in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, with their counterparts in Mexico and to assist with the identification of murdered women.

Thorough forensic analysis and DNA testing are necessary to identify the bodies that have been found to date. An example of how this technology can be crucial to an investigation took place in May 2005. With the cooperation of the El Paso Police Department and the FBI, the body of 7-year-old Airis Estrella Enriquez from Ciudad Juarez was identified and had her killers brought to justice due to DNA analysis.

In addition, with the financial assistance of USAID, the Bode Technology Group, a DNA laboratory located in Springfield, Virginia, and local forensic teams have been collecting thousands of samples from exhumed remains in order to process the samples and help identify possible future matches. This technology will not only provide answers and bring peace of mind to the families, enabling them to grieve, heal and seek justice for their murdered loved ones, but it will also contribute to the strengthening of judicial institutions in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sending our sincere condolences to the families of murdered women, condemning the homicide against women, and encouraging the U.S. and Mexican authorities to work together to solve these murders and help ensure the safety of the women of Ciudad Juarez. Please support H. Con. Res. 90.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 90 and stand in solidarity with the families of 370 women who have been abducted, brutally assaulted, raped and murdered in the Mexican cities of Ciudad Juarez and Chihuahua since 1993. These families seek justice for the atrocious acts committed against their daughters—some as young as the age of 13—and I urge President Bush to offer whatever assistance he can to bring these criminals to justice.

Even today, we do not know who many of the perpetrators are. Many of the victims bodies have yet to be identified and returned to their families. Local government and law enforcement agencies in the State of Chihuahua

have been ineffective in their investigations and require massive reform. Spurred by public outcry, the Mexican Federal Government launched a special investigation into the local governing bodies, only to uncover countless instances of negligence and abuse of power by over 100 police, prosecutors, and other government officials.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation as members of the international community to condemn violence against women and offer humanitarian assistance where we can. The President and the Secretary of State must intervene in this matter. These vicious criminals must be prosecuted and punished to the full extent of the law as soon as possible. We cannot allow ineffective government officials and bureaucratic defects to prevent justice from being served.

The families of these 370 women deserve closure and we must do all we can to prevent any further tragedies of this nature from recurring. As a father, grandfather, and husband, I could not think of any more horrific or painful a tragedy to strike a family.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 90, Conveying the Sympathy of Congress to the Families of the Young Women Murdered in the State of Chihuahua, Mexico, and Encouraging Increased United States Involvement in Bringing an End to These Crimes. I am a cosponsor to this important resolution and would like to thank Representative SOLIS for introducing this legislation.

For over thirteen years, a stones throw from the U.S. border, almost 400 women and young teenagers have been brutally assaulted and murdered. A disgraceful number of these murders have still not been resolved and many perpetrators still roam free, attacking other innocent women.

Family members of murdered women have worked tirelessly to try to bring justice to their daughters, wives and sisters. They have often faced great odds and opposition from local Mexican officials, yet have continued to fight for the truth and work to try to prevent future atrocities by bringing the rule of law to Ciudad Juárez and Chihuahua. My heart goes out to these families for their losses, and I urge the FBI, the U.S. State Department and all levels of the government of Mexico to reinvigorate their efforts and work to do all that is possible to bring justice and closure to these horrible tragedies.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 90, and I wish to express my respect and admiration for the gentle lady from California, Congresswoman SOLIS, for her important leadership on this tragic issue.

Since 1993, nearly 440 women have been killed in Ciudad Juarez and the State of Chihuahua, Mexico. Most of the victims are young, poor women. Nearly one-third worked in maquiladora factories that flourish along the U.S.-Mexican border; another third were students; Over 100 of these women were sexually assaulted prior to their murders, and these cases may be related. Other murders appear to be the product of domestic and intimate partner violence.

Regrettably, the Mexican authorities have done little to investigate the murders: According to human rights investigations into these

murders, at least 130 police, prosecutors, and forensic officials were negligent or abusive in their handling of the murder investigations. Frequently, these officers of the law blame the victim for her own violent death. They have ignored, deceived, harassed and even attacked the families of the victims. While a few men have been convicted for some of the sexual murders, several of the victims' families believe these men are scapegoats, while the real perpetrators remain free at-large. As long as the wrong people are in prison, the killers remain unpunished and able to kill again and again.

We know that the police have used torture to obtain confessions from several people, even though no physical evidence connected these individuals to the crimes. For example, days after eight women's bodies were found in a field in downtown Juarez, two men were arrested and tortured into confessing to their murders. No physical evidence links them to the crime. Police killed one of their lawyers. One of the men died in prison. The judge presiding over the case ignored the remaining detainee's credible allegations of torture and the lack of evidence against him, and convicted him to 50 years in prison for the murders. The families of the murdered women do not believe he is the person responsible for their daughters' deaths.

Mr. Speaker, the Ciudad Juarez murders are an issue that embraces both sides of the border: U.S. citizens have been arrested for the murders, have been victims of the murders, and have had loved ones lost to murder. U.S. citizen Cynthia Kiecker and her husband, a Mexican national, were arrested and tortured in June 2003, accused of the murder of a young woman in Chihuahua. They were acquitted in December 2004. In another case, one U.S. citizen's daughter disappeared in July 2000.

I believe that the Mexican government will respond to U.S. and international pressure to solve these murders and bring peace of mind to the victims' families, and restore peace and security to the people who live in the State of Chihuahua and Ciudad Juarez, in particular. Already, as a result of international pressure, the federal Mexican government has appointed a special commissioner to prevent violence against women in Juarez, as well as appointing a special prosecutor to find out what went wrong with the previous murder investigations.

But Mexican federal and state authorities have made too many promises, and still there is too little progress in any of these investigations.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 90 will clearly tell the families of these women that their voices and their pleas for justice have not gone unheard. They have our sympathy, and they have our support. But passage of this bill will also send a clear message to the Mexican authorities that the United States Congress is concerned about these murders, willing to have our government assist in their investigation, and that we want the perpetrators of these heinous acts arrested and put behind bars.

The lives of all these young women had meaning and promise. Let us remember them now, and solemnly vow to their families that we will work to bring their killers to justice.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 90, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD WATER DAY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 658) supporting the goals and ideals of World Water Day, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 658

Whereas the global celebration of World Water Day is an initiative that grew out of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro;

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, via resolution, designated March 22 of each year as World Water Day;

Whereas although water resources are renewable, differences in availability of water resources exist due to variations in seasonal and annual precipitation in different parts of the world;

Whereas although water is the most widely occurring substance on earth, only 2.53 percent of all water is freshwater and the remainder is salt water;

Whereas freshwater resources are further reduced by various forms of industrial, chemical, human, and agricultural pollution;

Whereas the drainage of wetlands for agriculture and the dissipation of water sources by land clearance lead to further exacerbation of water scarcity;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, by the middle of this century, at worst, seven billion people in 60 countries will be water-scarce;

Whereas the poor are the most affected by water scarcity, with 50 percent of the populations of developing countries exposed to polluted water sources;

Whereas water-related diseases are among the most common causes of illness and death, afflicting primarily the poor in developing countries;

Whereas the estimated mortality rate due to diseases transmitted by water and sanitation is five million people per year;

Whereas initiatives that promote access to safe drinking water and sanitation that prevents contaminants from infiltrating fresh drinking water supplies are vital tools in raising the awareness of the importance of freshwater to the quality of life; and

Whereas freshwater is vital to the development, sustainability, and progression of all humanity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Water Day;

(2) recognizes the importance of conserving and managing water resources for sustainable development, including environmental integrity and the eradication of poverty and hunger, and human health and overall qual-

ity of life in the United States and across the globe; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe World Water Day with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of water and water conservation to humanity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 658, expressing support for the goals and ideals of World Water Day. The global celebration of World Water Day is an initiative that grew out of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. The United Nations General Assembly by resolution designated March 22 of each year as World Water Day.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for introducing this important resolution. Passing this resolution will add to the strong bipartisan support in Congress for fighting global water challenges. This resolution builds upon the accomplishments of this Congress as embodied in the Senator Paul Simon Water For the Poor Act of 2005, Public Law 109-121, introduced by Mr. BLUMENAUER.

Water-related illnesses claim the life of one child approximately every 8 to 15 seconds, killing up to 5,000 children a day and up to 5 million people every year. The statistics associated with global water issues are shocking. According to the World Health Organization, 1.2 billion people do not have access to safe water, and 2.4 billion people lack access to basic sanitation.

World Water Day helps to raise awareness among international community members about this humanitarian catastrophe which places global development and human security in peril.

This resolution communicates our support for World Water Day. It recognizes the importance of conserving and managing water resources for sustainable development, environmental integrity, and the eradication of poverty and hunger, human health and overall quality of life; and it encourages the people of the United States to observe World Water Day.

Paula Dobriansky, the Under Secretary For Democracy and Global Affairs, recently led the U.S. delegation to the fourth World Water Forum in Mexico City, Mexico. Under Secretary Dobriansky's remarks emphasized the linkages between increased access to safe water and sanitation to improving human development indicators.

The administration has taken some noteworthy actions in response to these challenges. The Water For the Poor and Clean Water For People are initiatives equaling almost \$1.5 billion combined are positive contributions that will advance the United Nations Millennium Development Goals and implement the Johannesburg Plan by 2015 to reduce the number of people by one-half who have no access to safe drinking water and sanitation.

I invite my colleagues and staff to learn more about what the private sector and the U.S. Government are doing to meet these challenges this Thursday at an event sponsored by the Rotary Club of Washington and water advocates. This event will focus on safe water and sanitation worldwide and implementing the Senator Simon Water For the Poor Act. The event will take place on Thursday, May 4, at 11 a.m. in the Montpelier Room of the Library of Congress. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I would first like to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for introducing this very important measure, and my good friend and fellow member of the International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), for his advocacy on behalf of all matters related to the global environment.

Mr. Speaker, this past December the President signed the Senator Paul Simon Water For the Poor Act. This important piece of legislation demonstrated the United States' steadfast commitment to clean water and safe sanitation by designating it a major foreign policy goal of the United States.

We further solidified this commitment by participating in the fourth World Water Forum held in March. Our Nation joined with the rest of the international community in Mexico City to discuss the most pressing issues facing access to clean water and sanitation.

I would like to commend Under Secretary For Democracy and Global Affairs Paula Dobriansky, for leading the U.S. delegation to the World Water Forum and for the decision to join the international community in calling for global action on water and sanitation issues.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution on the floor today is yet another defining step

in our quest to see all people gain access to clean water by supporting the goals and ideals of World Water Day, conserving and managing water resources for sustainable development.

In the interest of keeping with our core humanitarian values and promoting sustainable development worldwide, we must continue to promote the goals of clean water, sound water conservation and management, and basic sanitation. I strongly support this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I urge all of my colleagues to also support it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to extend my appreciation to the leadership of the International Relations Committee, particularly Chairman HYDE and the ranking member, Mr. LANTOS, and the subcommittee people for working with me to advance this measure. I would also like to thank Mr. BLUMENAUER for serving as my partner on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 658 supports the goals and ideals of World Water Day, an initiative born out of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. The day is to be observed consistent with the recommendations called for by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development's Fresh Water Resources Agenda which urges the protection of the quality and supply of fresh water resources.

While I am aware that the official date recognizing World Water Day has passed, it is my respectful view that raising public awareness regarding one of the Earth's most precious resources should be year-round. Water is vital to human life, as a matter of fact, all life; and although it is the most widely occurring substance on Earth, it is important to note that only approximately 2 percent of all water is fresh water.

As various forms of pollution and sprawl continue to adversely impact our fresh water supplies, it is imperative now more than ever that the importance of integrated water resources development and conservation and improving the overall quality of life here in the United States and across the globe be highlighted.

Each day, millions of Americans turn to their faucets and their bottles for fresh drinking water, rarely giving a thought to the current demands our water supplies and infrastructure face. Yet while many Americans may think that water resource and development challenges are particularly associated with less-developed countries, it is important to note that the United States is not immune from some of the same challenges.

In 1972, this body enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, commonly known as the Clean Water Act. The act promised that all Americans

would have access to healthy waterways and clean drinking water. Although considerable progress has been made since enactment of this legislation to ensure the integrity of our water, many challenges persist as initiatives to comprehensively overhaul the act have stalled.

The Nation's wastewater treatment infrastructure, typically the first line of defense in keeping harmful pollutants out of our fresh water supplies, is in desperate need of investment. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, as much as \$390 billion will be needed over the next two decades to rebuild, repair, and upgrade the Nation's wastewater treatment infrastructure.

Controlling the discharge of toxic pollutants such as heavy metals and inorganic chemicals into our waterways is also becoming an increasing challenge.

□ 1615

Data reported by the EPA indicates that 39 percent of river and stream miles assessed by States and 45 percent of assessed lake acreage do not meet the applicable water quality standards and are impaired for one or more desired uses.

Further, approximately 95,000 lakes and 544,000 river miles in the United States are under fish-consumption advisories due to chemical contaminants in lakes, rivers, and coastal waters.

As of 2003, mercury, a contaminant of increasing concern, has forced 45 States to issue partial or statewide fish and shellfish consumption advisories.

As the ranking member on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, I feel strongly that our water policy needs a strong set of government standards and safeguards to continue to protect public health and safety.

We should build on our achievements made possible by innovations, like the Clean Water Act, and not turn our back on them.

Congress should reaffirm and restore the Clean Water Act, which has made our water valuable for drinking, fishing, swimming and other economically vital uses for over 30 years. The Nation's future generations are depending on us.

For our children's sake, it is important that we place responsible stewardship of our Nation's water resources and water infrastructure back on our priorities for our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. There are metropolitan areas now that advise people not to drink the public water.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 658, supporting the goals and ideals of World Water Day, which I introduced with Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the Ranking Member on our Water Resources and the Environment Subcommittee.

Access to safe drinking water and sanitation is critical to promoting good health, fighting

poverty, protecting the environment, empowering women and promoting economic growth around the world. These were the goals of the "Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act," which I introduced last year. This legislation, which was signed into law on December 1st, establishes water and sanitation as a cornerstone of United States foreign assistance efforts.

I look forward to working with my colleagues, concerned organizations, and the administration to help ensure that the United States is a leader on global water issues and works hard to make the goals and ideals of World Water Day a reality for over a billion people around the world in need.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I also have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 658, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 697, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 392, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 658, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT OF ITALY UPON THE SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THE 2006 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 697, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 697, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver

Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert

Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)

LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer

Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner

Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Baker
Bishop (UT)
Boren
Buyer
Carson
Crowley
Davis (FL)
Diaz-Balart, M.
Evans
Ford
Green (WI)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jones (OH)
Miller, George
Nussle
Osborne
Pascrell
Payne
Rush
Souder
Strickland
Sweeney
Visclosky

□ 1853

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution congratulating the people and Government of Italy, the Torino Olympic Organizing Committee, the International Olympic Committee, the United States

Olympic Committee, the 2006 United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams, and all international athletes upon the successful completion of the 2006 Olympic Winter Games in Turin, Italy.'.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 58TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 392, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to suspend the rules and agree to House Concurrent Resolution 392, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]
YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Capps	Eshoo
Ackerman	Capuano	Etheridge
Aderholt	Cardin	Everett
Akin	Cardoza	Farr
Alexander	Carnahan	Fattah
Allen	Carter	Feeney
Andrews	Case	Ferguson
Baca	Castle	Filner
Bachus	Chabot	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Baird	Chandler	Flake
Baker	Chocola	Foley
Baldwin	Clay	Forbes
Barrett (SC)	Cleaver	Fortenberry
Barrow	Clyburn	Fossella
Bartlett (MD)	Coble	Fox
Barton (TX)	Cole (OK)	Frank (MA)
Bass	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bean	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Beauprez	Cooper	Gallely
Becerra	Costa	Garrett (NJ)
Berkley	Costello	Gerlach
Berman	Cramer	Gibbons
Berry	Crenshaw	Gilchrest
Biggart	Crowley	Gillmor
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gingrey
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Gomert
Bishop (NY)	Culberson	Gonzalez
Blackburn	Cummings	Goode
Blumenauer	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte
Blunt	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Granger
Boehner	Davis (KY)	Graves
Bonilla	Davis, Jo Ann	Green, Al
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Green, Gene
Bono	Deal (GA)	Grijalva
Boozman	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Boswell	DeGette	Gutknecht
Boucher	Delahunt	Hall
Boustany	DeLauro	Harman
Boyd	DeLay	Harris
Bradley (NH)	Dent	Hart
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (FL)
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastings (WA)
Brown (OH)	Dicks	Hayes
Brown (SC)	Dingell	Hayworth
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Hefley
Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Hensarling
Ginny	Doyle	Herger
Burgess	Drake	Herseth
Burton (IN)	Dreier	Higgins
Butterfield	Duncan	Hinchee
Calvert	Edwards	Hinojosa
Camp (MI)	Ehlers	Hobson
Campbell (CA)	Emanuel	Hoekstra
Cannon	Emerson	Holden
Cantor	Engel	Holt
Capito	English (PA)	Honda

Hooley	Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Hostettler	Meeks (NY)	T.
Hoyer	Melancon	Sanchez, Loretta
Hulshof	Mica	Sanders
Hunter	Michaud	Saxton
Hyde	Millender-	Schakowsky
Inglis (SC)	McDonald	Schiff
Inslee	Miller (FL)	Schmidt
Israel	Miller (MI)	Schwartz (PA)
Issa	Miller (NC)	Schwarz (MI)
Istook	Miller, Gary	Scott (GA)
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Jefferson	Mollohan	Sensenbrenner
Jenkins	Moore (KS)	Serrano
Jindal	Moore (WI)	Sessions
Johnson (CT)	Moran (KS)	Shadegg
Johnson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Shaw
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy	Shays
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Sherman
Jones (NC)	Musgrave	Sherwood
Kanjorski	Myrick	Shimkus
Kaptur	Nadler	Shuster
Keller	Napolitano	Simmons
Kelly	Neal (MA)	Simpson
Kennedy (MN)	Neugebauer	Skelton
Kennedy (RI)	Ney	Slaughter
Kildee	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Kind	Nunes	Smith (WA)
King (IA)	Oberstar	Snyder
King (NY)	Obey	Sodrel
Kingston	Oliver	Solis
Kirk	Ortiz	Spratt
Kline	Otter	Stark
Knollenberg	Owens	Stearns
Kolbe	Oxley	Stupak
Kucinich	Pallone	Sullivan
Kuhl (NY)	Pascarella	Tancredo
LaHood	Pastor	Tanner
Langevin	Paul	Tauscher
Lantos	Pearce	Taylor (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Larson (CT)	Pence	Terry
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Leach	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Pickering	Thornberry
Levin	Pitts	Tiahrt
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Tiberi
Lewis (GA)	Poe	Tierney
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Towns
Linder	Pomeroy	Turner
Lipinski	Porter	Udall (CO)
LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Udall (NM)
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (NC)	Upton
Lowe	Pryce (OH)	Van Hollen
Lucas	Putnam	Velázquez
Lungren, Daniel	Radanovich	Walden (OR)
E.	Rahall	Walsh
Lynch	Ramstad	Wamp
Mack	Rangel	Wasserman
Maloney	Regula	Schultz
Manzullo	Rehberg	Waters
Marchant	Reichert	Watson
Markey	Renzi	Watt
Marshall	Reyes	Waxman
Matheson	Reynolds	Weiner
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (PA)
McCaul (TX)	Rogers (MI)	Weller
McCormack (MN)	Rohrabacher	Westmoreland
McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen	Wexler
McCrery	Ross	Whitfield
McDermott	Rothman	Wicker
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
McHenry	Royce	Wilson (SC)
McHugh	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Wu
McKinney	Ryun (KS)	Wynn
McMorris	Sabo	Young (AK)
McNulty	Salazar	Young (FL)
Meehan		

NOT VOTING—19

Bishop (UT)	Ford	Payne
Boren	Green (WI)	Rush
Buyer	Jackson-Lee	Souder
Carson	(TX)	Strickland
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Sweeney
Davis (TN)	Nussle	Visclosky
Evans	Osborne	

□ 1902

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD WATER DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 658, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 658, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 14, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]
YEAS—397

Abercrombie	Castle	Gallely
Ackerman	Chabot	Gerlach
Aderholt	Chocola	Gibbons
Akin	Clay	Gillmor
Alexander	Cleaver	Gingrey
Allen	Clyburn	Gonzalez
Andrews	Coble	Goode
Baca	Cole (OK)	Goodlatte
Bachus	Conyers	Gordon
Baird	Cooper	Granger
Baker	Costa	Graves
Baldwin	Costello	Green, Al
Barrett (SC)	Cramer	Green, Gene
Barrow	Crenshaw	Grijalva
Bartlett (MD)	Crowley	Gutierrez
Barton (TX)	Cubin	Gutknecht
Bass	Cuellar	Hall
Bean	Culberson	Harman
Beauprez	Cummings	Harris
Becerra	Davis (AL)	Hart
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hastings (WA)
Berry	Davis (KY)	Hayes
Biggart	Davis, Jo Ann	Hayworth
Bilirakis	Davis, Tom	Hefley
Bishop (GA)	Deal (GA)	Hensarling
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Herger
Blackburn	DeGette	Herseth
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Higgins
Blunt	DeLauro	Hinchee
Boehlert	DeLay	Hinojosa
Boehner	Dent	Hobson
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holden
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holt
Bono	Dicks	Honda
Boozman	Dingell	Hooley
Boswell	Doggett	Hostettler
Boucher	Doolittle	Hoyer
Boustany	Doyle	Hulshof
Boyd	Drake	Hunter
Bradley (NH)	Dreier	Hyde
Brady (PA)	Duncan	Inglis (SC)
Brady (TX)	Edwards	Inslee
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Israel
Brown (SC)	Brown (SC)	Issa
Brown, Corrine	Emerson	Istook
Brown-Waite,	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Ginny	English (PA)	Jefferson
Burgess	Eshoo	Jenkins
Burton (IN)	Etheridge	Jindal
Butterfield	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Farr	Johnson (IL)
Camp (MI)	Fattah	Johnson, E. B.
Campbell (CA)	Feeney	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Ferguson	Jones (NC)
Cantor	Filner	Kanjorski
Capito	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kaptur
Capps	Foley	Keller
Capuano	Forbes	Kelly
Cardin	Fortenberry	Kennedy (MN)
Cardoza	Fossella	Kennedy (RI)
Carnahan	Fox	Kildee
Carter	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Case	Frelinghuysen	Kind

King (IA)	Murphy	Schwarz (MI)
King (NY)	Murtha	Scott (GA)
Kirk	Musgrave	Scott (VA)
Kline	Myrick	Serrano
Knollenberg	Nadler	Sessions
Kolbe	Napolitano	Shaw
Kucinich	Neal (MA)	Shays
Kuhl (NY)	Ney	Sherman
LaHood	Northup	Sherwood
Langevin	Norwood	Shimkus
Lantos	Nunes	Shuster
Larsen (WA)	Oberstar	Simmons
Larson (CT)	Obey	Simpson
Latham	Oliver	Skelton
LaTourette	Ortiz	Slaughter
Leach	Otter	Smith (NJ)
Lee	Owens	Smith (TX)
Levin	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Lewis (CA)	Pallone	Snyder
Lewis (GA)	Pascarell	Sodrel
Lewis (KY)	Pastor	Solis
Linder	Pearce	Spratt
Lipinski	Pelosi	Stark
LoBiondo	Pence	Stearns
Lofgren, Zoe	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Lowey	Peterson (PA)	Sullivan
Lucas	Petri	Tancred
Lungren, Daniel E.	Pickering	Tanner
Lynch	Pitts	Tauscher
Mack	Platts	Taylor (MS)
Maloney	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Terry
Marchant	Porter	Thomas
Markey	Price (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Marshall	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Tiahrt
Matsui	Putnam	Tiberi
McCarthy	Radanovich	Tierney
McCaul (TX)	Rahall	Towns
McCollum (MN)	Ramstad	Turner
McCotter	Rangel	Udall (CO)
McCrery	Regula	Udall (NM)
McDermott	Rehberg	Upton
McGovern	Reichert	Van Hollen
McHenry	Renzi	Velázquez
McHugh	Reyes	Walden (OR)
McIntyre	Reynolds	Walsh
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Wamp
McKinney	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
McMorris	Rogers (MI)	Schultz
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Waters
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson
Meek (FL)	Ross	Watt
Meeks (NY)	Rothman	Waxman
Melancon	Roybal-Allard	Weiner
Mica	Ruppersberger	Weldon (FL)
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Millender-	Ryan (WI)	Weller
McDonald	Ryun (KS)	Westmoreland
Miller (FL)	Sabo	Wexler
Miller (MI)	Salazar	Whitfield
Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (NM)
Miller, George	Sanders	Wilson (SC)
Mollohan	Saxton	Wolf
Moore (KS)	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Moore (WI)	Schiff	Wu
Moran (KS)	Schmidt	Wynn
Moran (VA)	Schwartz (PA)	Young (AK)
		Young (FL)

NAYS—14

Conaway	Hoekstra	Royce
Flake	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Shadegg
Garrett (NJ)	Paul	Thornberry
Gohmert	Poe	

NOT VOTING—21

Bishop (UT)	Ford	Payne
Boren	Gilchrest	Rush
Buyer	Green (WI)	Souder
Carson	Jackson-Lee	Strickland
Chandler	(TX)	Sweeney
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Visclosky
Davis (TN)	Nussle	
Evans	Osborne	

□ 1919

Mr. POE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my home district and unable to record my vote for rollcall votes 111–113. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4297, the tax reconciliation conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows: I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4297 be instructed—

(1) to agree to the following provisions of the Senate amendment: section 461 (relating to revaluation of LIFO inventories of large integrated oil companies), section 462 (relating to elimination of amortization of geological and geophysical expenditures for major integrated oil companies), and section 470 (relating to modifications of foreign tax credit rules applicable to large integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers), and

(2) to recede from the provisions of the House bill that extend the lower tax rate on dividends and capital gains that would otherwise terminate at the close of 2008.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2830, PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2830, the pension conference report.

The form of the motion is as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2830 be instructed to recede to the provisions contained in the Senate amendment regarding restrictions on funding of nonqualified deferred compensation plans, except that—

(1) to the maximum extent possible within the scope of the conference, the managers on the part of the House shall insist that the restrictions under the bill as reported from conference regarding executive compensation, including under nonqualified plans, be the same as restrictions under the bill regarding benefits for workers and retirees under qualified pension plans,

(2) the managers on the part of the House shall insist that the definition of "covered employee" for purposes of such provisions contained in the Senate amendment include the chief executive officer of the plan sponsor, any other employee of the plan sponsor who is a "covered employee" within the meaning of such term specified in the provisions contained in the Senate amendment (applied by disregarding the chief executive officer), and any other individual who is,

with respect to the plan sponsor, an officer or employee within the meaning of section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and

(3) in lieu of the effective date specified in such provisions contained in the Senate amendment, the managers on the part of the House shall insist on the effective date specified in the provisions of the bill as passed the House relating to treatment of nonqualified deferred compensation plans when the employer's defined benefit plan is in at-risk status.

GAS PRICES

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is business as usual for Congress today. Democrats are bemoaning the rising energy prices, while Republicans are looking for solutions. Democrats have done a lot of complaining about energy prices, but when it comes to offering ideas and solutions and ways to get out of this, they are noticeably silent.

Time and time again, Republicans have offered solutions to our Nation's energy crisis. We will have two bills up just this week. But the Democrats continue to say no. No to renewable fuels and nuclear energy, no to opening up resources in the ANWR, no to refineries, no to pipelines, no to cracking down on price gouging, no to a comprehensive energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the Democrats realize that no is not an energy policy. Democrats want a campaign issue; Republicans want a solution. Republicans once again are offering the American people a clear choice; Democrats, obstruction.

"FIRST" ROBOTICS COMPETITION

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday I had a wonderful opportunity to witness, firsthand, America's innovative spirit in action. An organization named For Inspiration and Recognition of Science and Technology, FIRST, held its 15th annual Robotic Competition Championship in Atlanta.

Founded in 1989 by Dean Kamen, FIRST is a world-renowned organization that promotes the study and application of science, math, engineering and technology. Over the 3 days of competition, 28,000 participants from seven different countries took part, including students from Wheeler High School in my own district. During the events, students were immersed in an intense competitive environment where they employed innovative solutions to solve real-life engineering problems in a sports-like activity. Teamwork, ingenuity, flexibility and cooperation are all rewarded.

In a continually evolving and competitive global market, Americans

must work to retain our time-honored spirit of scientific leadership. Math and science are invaluable pillars of a strong education; and our schools, in coordination with organizations like FIRST, will ensure the creation of a new generation of world leaders, but only if we are proactively committed.

PRICE OF GASOLINE

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the price of gasoline is \$3 a gallon. Americans want answers, and they want solutions. According to the American Petroleum Institute, the nationwide average of tax on gasoline is 45 cents a gallon. This is split between State and Federal governments. The oil companies make about 9 cents a gallon on gasoline, so Washington, D.C., makes more off a gallon of gasoline than the oil companies.

Congress should consider suspending part of the gasoline tax for a period of time to lower gasoline prices. Gasoline prices are going up because OPEC controls 50 percent of the world's crude and is driving up the price of gasoline. The U.S. needs to be drilling offshore. Now we only drill off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, and Alabama. There is crude out there in our gulf coast and east coast and even the sacred west coast.

We can't have it both ways: Refuse to drill offshore and have cheaper gasoline prices. It is not going to work. We can drill safely offshore, and we need to do so to prevent being held hostage by third-world countries. Mr. Speaker, that's just the way it is.

CHILD SAFETY ACT

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to thank the hardworking law enforcement that have captured an escaped child sexual predator, Michael Benson, making our family safer. I commend John Walsh and his program, America's Most Wanted, on their 888th criminal apprehension out there making sure that we are putting these predators behind bars.

But 8 months ago, we passed the Child Safety Act; and in the Child Safety Act we have provisions that keeps our families, our children safer. Yet it is being obstructed in the Senate. It is time for us to move forward, pass this legislation that is so vital to our children's protection. I call for action and call on my colleagues to join me.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PHARMACIES ARE IN TROUBLE

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the gentleman's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much of what I am about in Congress is about the fight to preserve and enhance the opportunities that exist in rural America. My goal, among others, as a Member of Congress is to see that there is a future for the communities and the people who live there across my State. I represent one of the most rural districts in the country. A component of that is to make certain that the citizens of those rural communities can access adequate and affordable health care.

We often think of health care as a hospital or a physician. Tonight I rise with great concern about a development across our country and especially in rural America that is occurring in regard to the loss of community pharmacy. We are beginning the process of losing that Main Street business and that health care provider, the community pharmacist.

In many communities across my State, and I am sure it is true around the country, that community pharmacist is struggling and the doors are beginning to close. Examples: today in Kansas, southeast Kansas, the population less than a thousand people, that pharmacist is closed for the last 4 months, no other pharmacist in the community. The next pharmacy is 30-35 miles away. This has an impact not only upon the hospitals and doctors in that area, but clearly an impact upon the community members, the patrons of that pharmacy, those who rely upon the health care to be delivered by that pharmacist.

My own father, 90 years old, rarely sees a doctor because if you see a doctor, that doctor will tell you something is wrong with him, and he does not want to know that. But he relies upon his community pharmacist because he is there drinking a cup of coffee to put the blood pressure cuff on his arm and provide him advice and suggestions about a healthy life.

That community pharmacist is an important component of our business community, and it is a way we deliver

health care in communities across our country.

Due to the consequences of the prescription drug bill part D, our community pharmacist's future is bleak. In part it is due to the lack of timeliness of the payments that are occurring. The average wait in Kansas is 45-60 days. When I was in Leoti, Kansas, in March, and Leoti is a community of about 900 people, that community pharmacist had not been reimbursed for one prescription drug bill delivered to a senior since January 1.

Almost all pharmacists in my district and across the State have had to take out a line of credit just to stay in business. I want to highlight a bill that has been introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and a bill by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) that would require those sponsors of those drug plans to promptly pay the submitted claims.

It is unacceptable that a pharmacist would have to wait 2 months to be paid for the bills, and it is unacceptable because it is wrong. It is not the right thing to do, but it is a terrible occurrence because it means the demise of his or her business.

In addition to that, almost all pharmacists lose money on the prescriptions they fill under the Medicare plan part D, and the sponsors of those plans allow almost no negotiating room for those pharmacists. We need to change that. I would highlight a bill that I and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) have introduced, the Community Pharmacy Fairness Act, to give independent pharmacists the freedom to ban together to negotiate with drug manufacturers.

Time is of the essence. Pharmacist Kody Krein from St. Francis, Kansas, he grew up in that town. His life goal was to return to St. Francis as a community pharmacist. He has given us until July 1 and then he will make a decision whether he can continue as the sole pharmacist in that town. His three kids are in the school system in St. Francis, Kansas. It would be a terrible thing to lose that community pharmacist, to lose his family, and to lose that man's hope for a career in his hometown. That does not happen enough in rural America where a young son or young daughter actually is returning home to the family community. There is no pharmacist in the St. Francis area for 35 miles. We have a short period of time before we can correct this.

You may say this is a handful of examples. I am exercised about this issue. It is troublesome to me that this Congress, this place, Washington, D.C., has become so political that we cannot address this issue, that if an issue is brought to the floor that we are fearful that the Democrats will make an issue of it, that we have come to the point where nothing is done because there are political consequences to the issue even being discussed.

There are challenges and problems that are created by part D that need to be addressed. These issues are so important to me that it is time for us to set aside the political bickering and actually address the needs of the country. It is a political place that we work in. We all know that, but the problem is that we simply cannot use politics as an excuse to do nothing. It is time for us to make certain that good things occur and we cannot be responsible for the loss of a business, the loss of a family, and the loss of three students in a classroom in rural communities across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we no longer delay, that we bring attention to this issue to the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MISSION NOT ACCOMPLISHED

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, exactly 3 years ago yesterday, President Bush gave his speech about the military operations in Iraq and said they had become "Mission Accomplished."

Why was this speech important? Because in a single stroke, it revealed more about the President and his administration than all of his other speeches combined. Paying attention to the news, you will recall how on that day President Bush, adorned in a fighter pilot suit, rode shotgun in a military jet that landed on the USS ABRAHAM LINCOLN aircraft carrier, and a massive banner declaring "Mission Accomplished" was brashly displayed in the background during his subsequent speech.

It seemed like a bold act put on by a President who wanted to be perceived as taking bold steps against our Nation's enemies. But nothing had actually been accomplished to that point. The problem is that the "mission" in Iraq was not accomplished 3 years ago, and it certainly hasn't been accomplished today, which makes the military jet landing and ensuing speech 3 years ago far short of bold. It was a grandly staged political stunt, pure and simple.

Let us talk about "Mission Accomplished." For whom exactly is this mission accomplished? Is the mission accomplished for our troops, many of whom have returned home from Iraq forever changed as a result of the physical and mental trauma they endured

during years of repeated deployment to Iraq?

One such soldier is retired Naval Hospital Corpsman Charlie Anderson who last Thursday spoke at an Iraq forum that I organized. Charlie suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder and now is a regional coordinator for Iraq Veterans Against the War.

I quote him in saying, "I was completely untrained and unprepared for what I experienced in Iraq." He also told us, "In the 7 years preceding my deployment to the Middle East, I had not set foot in the desert or had any training on how to fight or survive there. I had fired my 9 millimeter service pistol exactly once."

Is the mission accomplished for Faiza al-Araji, an Iraqi civil engineer who recently fled Baghdad, the only home she has ever known? Faiza and her family left Iraq after her son, a student, was detained for days by the Ministry of the Interior without charges being filed. After nearly a week of panicking, Faiza and her husband paid a ransom to have their son released. They were told he had been detained because he had a beard, and was therefore probably a terrorist.

The fact is, 3 years after President Bush's "mission accomplished" pronouncement, Iraq is still mired in chaos. Our troops are still sitting ducks. They are halfway across the world, and the United States is still tangled up in a quagmire of epic proportions.

Of the over 2,400 American soldiers who have been killed in Iraq, all but 139 were killed after the President's USS ABRAHAM LINCOLN speech. Attacks against Iraqis, U.S. and coalition troops, and critical infrastructure have increased by nearly 25 percent since then.

According to the Brookings Institute, the Iraqi insurgency has tripled in strength since 2003. It is pretty clear by now that the "Mission Accomplished" speech was just another example in a long pattern of the Bush administration playing up the political theater while ignoring the facts on the ground.

Whether they are talking about tax cuts for the richest 1 percent of Americans, prescription drug coverage that does not work for seniors, or the cost of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, this administration's MO is to avoid revealing bad news at all cost, even if it means toying with the truth. It is like all of the bad stories are cut out of the newspaper before they are brought into the White House.

Mr. Speaker, let us accomplish something that will help secure America and Iraq for the future and save thousands of innocent lives in the process. Let us accomplish an end to the pain and suffering felt by the hundreds of thousands, and let's end the war in Iraq and bring our troops home now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHAT TO DO ABOUT SOARING OIL PRICES

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim my 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, gasoline prices are soaring and the people are screaming, and they want something done about it now.

\$100 rebate checks to American motorists will not cut it, nor will mandatory mileage requirements for new vehicles. Taxing oil profits will only force prices higher. But there are some very important things we can do immediately to help.

First, we must reassess our foreign policy and announce some changes. One of the reasons we went into Iraq was to secure our oil. Before the Iraq war, oil was less than \$30 a barrel. Today it is over \$70. The sooner we get out of Iraq and allow the Iraqis to solve their own problems the better. Since 2002, oil production in Iraq has dropped 50 percent. Pipeline sabotage and fires are routine, and we have been unable to prevent them. Soaring gasoline prices are a giant, unintended consequence of our invasion, pure and simple.

Second, we must end our obsession for a military confrontation with Iran. Iran does not have a nuclear weapon, and according to our own CIA is not on the verge of obtaining one for years. Iran is not in violation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and has a guaranteed right to enrich uranium for energy, in spite of the incessant government and media propaganda to the contrary. Iran has never been sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council, yet the drumbeat grows louder for attacking certain sites in Iran, either by conventional or even by nuclear means. Repeated resolutions by Congress stirs up unnecessary animosity toward Iran, and creates even more concern about future oil supplies from the Middle East.

We must quickly announce we do not seek war with Iran, remove the economic sanctions against her, and accept her offer to negotiate a diplomatic solution to the impacts. An attack on Iran, coupled with our continued presence in Iraq, could hike gas prices to \$5 or \$6 per gallon here at home. By contrast, a sensible approach to Iran could quickly lower oil prices by \$20 a barrel.

Third, we must remember that prices of all things go up because of inflation. Inflation, by definition, is an increase in the money supply. The money supply is controlled by the Federal Reserve and responds to the deficits Congress creates. When deficits are excessive, as they are today, the Fed creates

new dollars out of thin air to buy Treasury bills and keeps interest rates artificially low. But when new money is created out of nothing, the money already in circulation loses value.

□ 1945

Once this is recognized, prices rise, some more rapidly than others. That is what we see today with the cost of energy.

Exploding deficits due to runaway entitlement spending and the cost of dangerous militarism create pressure for the Fed to inflate the money supply. This contributes greatly to the higher prices we all claim to oppose. If we want to do something about gas prices, we should demand and vote for greatly reduced welfare and military spending, a balanced budget, and fewer regulations that interfere with the market development of alternative fuels. We also should demand a return to a sound commodity monetary standard. All subsidies and special benefits to energy companies should be ended; and, in the meantime, let's eliminate Federal gas taxes at the pump.

Oil prices are at a level where consumers reduce consumption voluntarily. The market will work if we let it. But as great as the market economy is, it cannot overcome a foreign policy that is destined to disrupt oil supplies and threaten the world with an expanded and dangerous conflict in the Middle East.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECORD OIL COMPANY PROFITS

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim Mr. PALLONE's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I hope the American people are paying attention to the massive oil company profits being made off of the pocketbooks of our people. Gasoline prices have gone up 68 cents just since last year per gallon. Gasoline prices are soaring. I left Ohio this morning after casting my vote in the primary election. Gas was \$3 at the pump, and some of the brands were as high as \$3.85 a gallon.

Who are we making rich? ExxonMobil, they are number one. They declared a record quarterly profit of \$8.4 billion, 7 percent more than they made last year. Meanwhile, their chairman, Lee Raymond, is planning on his retirement. His package totals \$400 million when all pension payoffs and stock options are included.

I have often asked myself, what does somebody do with \$400 million? When is enough enough?

Now, this is the same Exxon that has yet to pay the \$4.5 billion in punitive damages awarded in the Exxon Valdez case 17 years ago. They haven't even paid off those they harmed.

Now, not to be outdone, ConocoPhillips said its earnings rose 13 percent, to \$3.29 billion, just in the first quarter of this year.

Now, Chevron Corporation's first quarter profits soared 49 percent, to \$4 billion, as the firm joined the procession of U.S. oil companies reporting colossal earnings.

Meanwhile, constituent after constituent in my district tells me they can no longer afford weekend family trips due to gas prices. People are only filling their tanks up halfway, hoping prices will drop and they will not have to pay these exorbitant prices.

Other companies like Halliburton, think about this. We have a Vice President. He got a tax refund of nearly \$22 million. Halliburton is an oil servicing firm that has gotten so many no-bid contracts from this government related to the war in Iraq and other oil-related expenditures. Come on. Can't we connect those dots? Can't we figure out what's going on here?

Farmers tell me that higher fuel costs mean their already ultra-slim margin of profit is likely to disappear.

Small businesses worry about whether or not they can impose delivery surcharges to make up for higher fuel costs.

Now, all the President of the United States says, listen carefully. He says we have to study this. Hmm. He says we have to study this. We have to study the profits.

Mr. President, we need to do something. The President says that these companies should reinvest their money in energy projects here. But keep in mind that Exxon officials told the staff of the House Energy and Commerce Committee this year that Exxon doesn't intend to spend any money in this country because of flat demand for petroleum products by the year 2030. So the President appears to be some days late and a refinery short.

Something the President could do, using his Presidential authority, is to change the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to a Strategic Fuels Reserve and begin converting this country to non-oil-based fuels. His agriculture bill didn't do that. We put a title IX in the agriculture bill to convert quickly. We can do ethanol and biodiesel right now. But guess who won't sell it? Every one of those oil companies.

Think about the communities you live in. Let's say you buy a Ford Taurus that is an E85, and you can put ethanol in the tank. Unless you are from Minnesota or Iowa, where are you going to buy the fuel? Guess who locks you out at the pump? Every single one of those companies, because they want business as usual.

At some point, we have to do what is right for the country before any single company's interests. This is in the na-

tional interest not to have the economy take a nosedive again because of our dependence on imported petroleum.

The other body is contemplating the cute idea of a \$100 tax rebate to every citizen. Well, what does that do about the price of gasoline? What does that do about converting the type of fuel you put in your tank and making America energy independent again? What does this do to end our presidentially decreed addiction to oil from unstable regimes? All it does is it transfers wealth to those very same companies that are locking out the new future for America, the new energy future we needed to embark upon in the last century and, sadly, we did not have the leadership to do it.

So profits are up again. Golden parachutes are being readied. The industry snubs its nose at the consuming public that can't afford these prices. The Bush government says, trust us, let's just study some more. That is all we need to do is study.

Is it any reason the American people are upset? They have a right to be upset. We need leadership in this government. No more followership.

[From The Blade: Toledo, Ohio, Friday, Apr. 28, 2006.]

QUARTERLY PROFIT TOPS \$8 BILLION AT EXXON MOBIL

ASSOCIATED PRESS

DALLAS—Exxon Mobil Corp. posted the fifth-highest quarterly profit for any public company in history yesterday, and with oil prices above \$70 a barrel it could go down as the company's weakest quarter for the year.

Exxon Mobil's first quarter was lower than its record fourth-quarter, when the world's largest oil company reported the highest profits ever for any publicly traded company. And the earnings, which rose 7 percent to more than \$8 billion, still fell short of analysts' estimates.

But, in what is sure to spur the growing furor over outsized energy industry earnings, Exxon Mobil's massive profits may only increase in 2006 as it benefits from rising crude-oil prices and production, analysts say.

"This is only the beginning," said Fadel Gheit, analyst for Oppenheimer & Co. "Let me tell you, it gets better after that. Oil prices will add huge amounts to earnings, at least a billion dollars."

The earnings report comes amid consumer outcry in the United States about soaring gasoline prices, which average \$2.91 a gallon nationwide, or 68 cents higher than a year ago.

It also lands as Washington lawmakers are looking to appease voters with various proposals to make big oil companies pay more taxes or provide consumers with some other relief. But everyone acknowledges that little can be done in the short term to bring down prices.

"If we had a silver bullet, we, would be proposing it to Washington, right now," said Ken Cohen, the company's vice president of public affairs. He said Exxon Mobil was investing a growing portion of its profits in new oil and gas production, and that the company is sympathetic to the added energy-price burden on consumers.

Still, he said consumers and members of Congress need to "take a deep pause and a deep breath" because market forces will eventually bring supply and demand back into balance. He said Congress could help

matters longer term by removing barriers to domestic drilling.

The increasing public scrutiny of Exxon arrives less than a month after the news that the company handed its former chairman and chief executive officer, Lee Raymond, a \$400 million retirement package, when all pension payoffs and stock options are included, that sparked headlines across the country and calls in Washington to justify the huge compensation.

In January, Exxon posted the highest quarterly profits of any public company in history: \$10.71 billion for the fourth quarter of 2005 and \$36.13 billion for the full year.

Howard Silverblatt, a senior index analyst for Standard & Poor's, said the latest profit figure still places Exxon fifth historically among quarterly earnings. Exxon also holds the first, second, and fourth spots; Royal Dutch Shell PLC has the third spot.

In the first quarter, net income rose to \$8.4 billion, or \$1.37 per share, from \$7.86 billion, or \$1.22 per share, a year ago. Roughly three-quarters of that profit came from the company's upstream division, which produces oil and natural gas.

Analysts polled by Thomson Financial were looking for a higher profit of \$1.47 per share for the latest quarter.

Analysts and company executives identified two major contributors to coming up a dime short: higher taxes on oil and gas produced abroad and reduced income from Exxon's refining business, which spent heavily on maintenance in the aftermath of last year's hurricanes.

HIGH GAS PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, as we well know, the rising cost of gasoline is a burden on hard-working families and on small businesses across the country.

Recently, the price of crude oil hit the historic high of \$75 a barrel. The average price of gasoline is now a whopping \$2.92 cents a gallon, and it shows no sign of dropping before the busy summer travel season.

While much of this is the result of increasing demand generated by our growing economy and increased instability in Iran and other oil-producing countries, Congress has a duty to take action.

Some in Congress like to play politics on this issue. The American people don't want cheap political games and stunts. They want and deserve solutions.

We provided good solutions in the strong conservation and renewable energy titles of the energy bill that we passed last year. Had it not been for political gamesmanship, these measures, which languished in Congress for 4 years after we passed it in the House, would already be reducing gas prices with more hybrid and E85 ethanol cars on the road and more biofuels to fuel them.

Instead, these policies are just being implemented now. Over time, I believe that last year's energy bill will help bring down the cost of energy for consumers, but, in the meantime, we must do more.

Last year, in the House, we passed the Gas Act that would not only streamline the process of expanding refineries but also provide, for the first time, a Federal criminal penalty for price gouging in gasoline or diesel fuel cells.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we ought to stop giving tax incentives to big oil and gas producers when they are already reporting record profits. That is why last year I introduced legislation with Congressman MARK UDALL to redirect \$2.5 billion in tax incentives away from the oil and gas companies, instead put it towards doubling incentives for E85 ethanol, hybrid and hydrogen vehicle production.

Renewable fuels are the key to our energy independence and to freeing drivers from the high cost of imported oil. We need only look to my home State of Minnesota, which has been leading the Nation in developing renewable fuels. Minnesota was the first state to require ethanol be sold in all gasoline and has been instrumental in the development of E85 fueling stations, with over 100 such stations throughout the State.

Mr. Speaker, the proof is at the pump. These policies have resulted in Minnesota gas prices being amongst the lowest in the country. It is common in Minnesota to see E85 being sold for 50 cents less than regular gasoline.

These savings should be enjoyed nationwide, which is why I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 4357, which was introduced last year by my fellow Minnesotan Congressman GUTKNECHT. This bill would require that our country adopt Minnesota's model that all gasoline should contain 10 percent renewable fuels.

We must get beyond the partisanship and obstruction that is blocking these additional measures. We have now waited for a year. We cannot afford to wait for 4 years. We must act now.

But we also must, in the meantime, make sure that the high gas prices don't destroy the strong economic growth that is providing jobs to so many. One of the first things we should do is a temporary suspension of the Federal gas tax. Suspending the gas tax will produce an immediate 18.4 cent per gallon savings for motorists when they fill up their tanks. That is why I will be introducing legislation to suspend the Federal gas tax throughout the summer driving season.

Highway trust fund revenue lost from this temporary suspension would be paid back and the fund made whole by fixing an oversight that has allowed some oil and gas companies to escape paying what they owe under the law to the Treasury. Unlike other measures, we can do this now, providing immediate relief to drivers hurting at the pump.

Mr. Speaker, high gas prices hurt American families and threaten our growing economy. We have a duty to respond. Let's stop the politics and get to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING C. RICHARD VAUGHN

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take Mr. BURTON's time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate my dear friend, Mr. C. Richard Vaughn of Mount Airy, North Carolina, for being awarded the 2006 Distinguished Citizen Award from the Old Hickory Council of Boy Scouts of America. This prestigious honor is given annually to one individual from Northwestern North Carolina who best exemplifies the ideals of scouting through contributions to community, State and country. In receiving this award, Richard joins an impressive fraternity of past recipients, including Senators Jesse Helms and Richard Burr.

I have had the honor and privilege of knowing Richard for the past 12 years and can honestly say that there are very few people as deserving of this award as he is. Richard is a true asset to the State of North Carolina and the Town of Mount Airy. The driving force in his life is a strong desire to serve others and make his community a better place.

Richard has truly exemplified the principles of Boy Scouting throughout his life from the time he was a young Eagle Scout. He has served our Nation as a First Lieutenant in the United States Army and has remained incredibly active in community and civic affairs throughout his adult life. He serves as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Central United Methodist Church in Mount Airy, as past president of the Mount Airy Museum of Regional History, as past president of the North Carolina State Chapter of Sigma Nu Fraternity, as past vice president of the United Fund of the Greater Mount Airy Chamber of Commerce, as president of the Reeves YMCA Community Center, as chairman of the Mount Airy Board of Education, as an executive committee member of the Old Hickory Council of Boy Scouts of America, and as the former Scoutmaster of Troop 596 of Mount Airy.

He has also served as the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the North

Carolina Granite Corporation, Chairman of Riverside Building Supply, Incorporated, and on the Board of Directors of Insteel Industries and United Plastics Corporation.

He also serves on the Board of Trustees for North Carolina State University and is a past member of the North Carolina Board of Transportation and a past member of the Board of the North Carolina State Ports Authority.

Richard attended North Carolina State University where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in nuclear engineering. Upon graduating, he served in the U.S. Army Ordnance Corps from 1961 to 1964. Afterward, he returned to Mount Airy and started working for his former Scoutmaster, Mr. John S. Clark, at the John S. Clark Construction Company. Richard has thrived in his nearly 40-year career at John S. Clark and has contributed greatly to the company's impressive growth and success. Now Richard serves as the Chief Executive Officer of the company.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Vaughn has contributed greatly to his hometown, his State and his country, both civically and professionally. Richard and his lovely wife, Betty Kay, have also been excellent role models for their children and grandchildren. I commend him for his commitment to service and congratulate him for receiving the 2006 Distinguished Citizen Award.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COSTA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, we have just received some news yesterday which I hope will sufficiently alarm every big spender that we have in the United States House of Representatives. Yesterday we received the annual report on the financial well-being of Medicare and Social Security from the trustees of those funds. They report that the fiscal situation has again deteriorated and, in fact, Social Security will become broke in 2040, 1 year sooner than expected, and Medicare will go broke in 2018, 2 years sooner than expected.

This is not good news, Mr. Speaker; but a number of us have been speaking out for weeks, for months, for years that we must do something in this body to change the fiscal path that we are on.

Now, today, if you are a senior receiving Medicare, receiving Social Security, you are going to be fine. But there is this great big baby boom generation that has been paying billions and billions of dollars into the funds, and soon they will be taking from the funds; and the fiscal situation will deteriorate rapidly.

The challenge that we have, though, Mr. Speaker, is that too many people in the Federal city, too many people in this body, are focused on the next election and not the next generation.

Now, the report we received is certainly not a crisis. It is not something we have to take care of today. We do not have to take care of it tomorrow, do not have to take care of it next week. But let there be no doubt about it, if we want to preserve Medicare and Social Security as we know these programs for the next generation, steps must be taken today. Otherwise, we will put our Nation on a course, on a

fiscal path, that will determine, that will actually ensure that our children, our grandchildren have a lower standard of living than we do.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is the week where we are due to vote on the budget, and the budget is always a time of great debate in this institution. And I hope that the American people focus on the fact that the budget is more than just numbers; it is more than just getting out a pencil with a stubby eraser; it is more than just red ink and black ink, and, unfortunately, it has been a lot more red ink than black ink. It is really about priorities. It is about the society that we want to have. It is about the legacy that we will leave the next generation.

I personally got into the parenthood business 4 years ago. I have a 4-year-old daughter and a 2½-year-old son. And I think a lot about the kind of America that I want my children to grow up in and all the children that I see in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas that I have the honor to represent in this body. I want to leave my children a legacy of greater hope, greater freedom, and greater opportunity. I do not wish to leave them a legacy of greater debt, greater taxes, and more big government bureaucratic solutions. That is not the America I want to leave them. I think that if we will just ford the frontiers of freedom, if we can have smart government, limited government, accountable government, then our children and grandchildren can have an even brighter future than what we enjoy today.

But as we debate this budget, it is a little bit like that film with the comedian called "Groundhog Day," where it seemed like he, Bill Murray, relives the same day over and over. And for those of us who have been veterans of these budget debates, it seems like the debate points never change. Maybe the numbers do and the situation gets more serious, but the debating points do not seem to change.

So first, Mr. Speaker, there will be a number of different budgets that we debate; but my guess is, if history is our guide, it will come down to one Republican budget and one Democrat budget.

Now, the Democrats will tell us that all these programs are being cut and if you will only send more money to Washington, we can solve all these problems for the American family. If you will just trust Washington, if you will just trust the liberal elite in the Nation's capital who know better about your family than you do, then everything will be fine.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what has been happening. First, Washington, D.C., our Federal Government, is now spending, last year, starting with last year, over \$22,000 per household. This is only the fourth time in the entire history of America that the Federal Government has spent this much money. It is the first time since World War II that the Federal Government has taken so much money away from hard-working American families to bring up

to Washington, D.C. And as you can tell from this chart, frankly, the trend line is very, very worrisome. And in just the past decade, look at what has happened: the average family income, as measured by median family income, 10 years ago was roughly \$45,000 per family of four. As you can tell from this bottom line, it has now increased over 10 years to about \$62,000 for a family of four.

But look at what has happened to the Federal budget. Ten years ago it was about \$1.6 trillion, and now it is approaching \$2.6 trillion for the next year. The Federal budget has outpaced the family budget by almost a full third in just the last decade. And the future trends are even more alarming.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight I want us to focus on what the future is going to look like if we do not change big spending ways in Washington and what the future can look like if we will just have smart government, limited government, accountable government, and trust the American people and trust freedom and trust hope and trust opportunity.

At this point, though, I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that we have been joined by an outstanding Member of the freshmen class who has been a real leader in the United States Congress in trying to protect the family budget from the Federal budget, to try to restrain out-of-control Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative HENSARLING for yielding. We all owe him a great debt for the work that he does in getting us this kind of information about what is happening with the budget. He has been a tremendous leader not just in the Republican Study Committee, where we talk about these things a great deal, but here on the floor, bringing the attention of the American people as well as the Members of Congress to these issues.

I say over and over again, when I get a chance to do so in small groups and in large groups, that what we have to refocus on in this Congress is the role of the Congress and the role of the Federal Government. What has happened in this country is we have allowed the Federal Government to get its tentacles into all kinds of issues that it has no business being in.

The Founders of this country were very, very concerned about the role of the Federal Government and wanted to keep a weak Federal Government and strong State governments. It made sense to do that. One of the ways that they did that was to spell out clearly what the responsibilities of the Federal Government would be and then say everything not mentioned here remains with the States. That is the 10th amendment of the Constitution. And we do not pay enough attention to that amendment, I think, on a day-to-day basis in this body; and we need to be

doing that because we have gotten involved in things we should not be involved in.

The number one role of the Federal Government is to provide for the defense of this country. However, what has happened is that over time Members of the Congress and the executive branch have decided that we should be like Santa Claus to the country and we should get involved in many, many other kinds of programs. We are very much involved in education. We are very much involved in health care through Medicare and Medicaid. We have the Social Security program, which is, I think, a cruel hoax on the American people. We have told the American people that we will provide for their retirement through the Social Security program; and as my colleague, Mr. HENSARLING, has pointed out, we keep getting sobering information about the requirements we have established for ourselves and what mechanisms we have for taking care of those requirements.

We have created, in the lexicon of our government, some terms that we need to get out of our lexicon. The word "entitlement" is something that is used a great deal. There is no such thing as an entitlement from the Federal Government, but we have created that over the years by our interest in creating power for ourselves here in the Congress. And it is a very insidious thing that has happened, which we need to do something about.

We also talk all the time about mandatory spending. Mandatory spending is talked about in terms of Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. These are programs that are put on automatic pilot, and nobody ever deals with them. Oh, every year somebody comes up with a study such as Congressman HENSARLING mentioned, and then people get nervous and then they stop talking about it.

Our colleagues on the other side talk all the time about the deficit. But day after day after day, they talk about both the deficit and then how we are not spending enough money on various programs. We cannot have it both ways, but yet we continue to try to have it both ways, and we have tried to convince the American people that we can have it both ways. But we cannot do that.

There is a big difference. The difference is that the folks on the other side think they know how to spend your money better than you know how to spend your money. Republicans have the opposite opinion. They think that you know how to spend your money better than the government knows how to spend your money. And to do that, we have made tax cuts in the last few years. I was not here when the major tax cut was made in 2001, but it is really responsible for why our economy is growing as well as it is growing. We have these terrible situations looming out there on the horizon, but the economy right now is doing well, and it is

a direct result of the tax cuts, letting the people keep more money in their pockets. Frankly, we have got to do more of that. We have got to cut back on Federal spending. We have got to get the Federal Government out of many of the programs that it is involved in and set some priorities.

Our number one priority has to be the defense of this Nation because State governments cannot do that and local governments cannot do that. We have to do that at the Federal level. That is our number one priority.

□ 2015

Then if we have funds to do other things, we must set our priorities based on what are the proper roles of the Federal government. Frankly, those roles are very narrow. We have to get back to a situation where we examine every program that we fund in the Federal government against those priorities and against what is outlined in the Constitution for us to do.

I am really proud again to be a small part of this presentation tonight where my colleagues are going to present the facts about where we stand with the budget and what we need to do to get our fiscal house in order in this country. We have seen socialism fail in Europe and in other countries. We know it doesn't work, and yet there are people in this country who think we can keep spending without regard to ever having to come to account for that spending.

I am happy to tell you tonight you are going to understand some of the things that we are doing that are creating our problems and what we might do in this country to solve this problem of overspending and get ourselves back on track that will lead to economic healthiness, instead of economic sickness in this country.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, again, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her great leadership in this body on trying to bring fiscal sanity to the Federal city and do something that can really make a difference in the lives of her constituents and for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, again we are talking tonight on the precipice of the great budget vote which occurs here in Congress each and every year. I think it is important that we get a number of facts out before this debate takes place. People are always entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts.

One of the opinions you will hear from Democrats on the other side of the aisle is that somehow the Republican budget is going to cut taxes. Well, I have looked very carefully at this budget. It doesn't cut taxes. What it does is it preserves the tax relief that has already been given to the American people in previous years. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it prevents a Democrat tax increase.

The American people, very few of them know this, but in Washington

spending is forever and tax relief is temporary. You have got to keep on voting to just keep the tax relief that you have already received. Yet spending goes on forever.

I think it was President Reagan who once said that the closest thing to eternal life on Earth is a Federal program, and indeed he was correct.

So, let's talk a little bit about what would happen if the Democrats succeed in making sure that they have a huge, automatic tax increase. They say that any fiscal woe that we have in the Nation is somehow the result of tax relief that was given out in earlier years.

If they have their way, if they roll back all the tax relief that has occurred, tax rates will rise substantially in each and every bracket on American families, right now when many of them are struggling to fill up the family pickup truck or the family car.

Low-income taxpayers, if the Democrats have their way and raise taxes on the American people, the 10 percent bracket will disappear and the 15 percent bracket will come back. That means our lowest wage earners who pay taxes, our lowest wage earners who pay taxes under the Democrat plan will see a 50 percent increase in their taxes. They call that compassion.

Married taxpayers will see the marriage penalty return, costing American families thousands of dollars. Taxpayers with children will lose 50 percent of their child tax credits if the Democrats have their way, if their budget is passed. The American people, Mr. Speaker, need to read the fine print.

Now, the Democrats will rail against the deficit, but they won't admit that under their budget, all these taxes increase on American families. Taxes on dividends and capital gains will jump by as much as 100 percent. Half of American families are invested in the stock market in their 401(k) plans. It is their retirement, particularly since the Democrats refuse to do anything to save Social Security for the next generation.

The depreciation period for leasehold improvements will increase from 15 to 39 years on small business, the job engine of America. If the Democrats have their way in their budget, taxes will increase on small businesses. And the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very happy to see that we have been joined by truly one of the great leaders in Congress to combat waste and fraud and abuse and duplication and I guess really dumb government. I am very happy to be joined by a dear friend of mine and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. CHOCOLA, who happens to be also the coauthor, along with myself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, of the Family Budget Protection Act, which is the most comprehensive piece of budget reform legislation that could be passed by this Congress. I am very happy to be joined by him. I would at this time yield to him to get his perspective.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding and thank him for his leadership on budget process reform, spending and many other very important issues. I appreciate you bringing us to the floor tonight to talk about what I think is the most important challenge we face as a Nation, because if we don't solve our fiscal challenges, really nothing else matters.

Since I was elected a few years ago, one of the probably most knowledgeable, honest, straightforward people I have talked to about fiscal issues in Congress is a guy named David Walker. He is the head of the GAO, the Comptroller General of the United States. What I would like to do is just share with you part of an op-ed that he put in an Atlanta newspaper recently. I will share here.

"News flash: The largest, most complex and arguably the most important entity on the face of the Earth recently failed an external audit for the ninth straight year." Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Entity failed an audit for 9 straight years in a row. "It also received an adverse opinion on its system of internal control over financial management and reporting.

"If that is not bad enough, this entity overspent by \$319 billion on a cash basis," that is billion dollars, on a cash basis, and on an accrual basis, it was \$760 billion in fiscal 2005. "Worse yet, the accumulated liabilities and unfunded commitments for this entity have risen from about 20 trillion," that is with a T, "at the end of fiscal year 2000 to more than 46 trillion," with a T, "at the end of fiscal year 2005.

"If this news flash were related to any multinational corporation, it would have been on the front page of every newspaper in the world and at the top of every news broadcast in the world. However, this news flash doesn't relate to a company, it relates to a country, the United States of America.

"As Washington embarks on its budget cycle, the facts are clear and compelling that the Federal government is on an imprudent and unsustainable fiscal path that, if not effectively addressed, could serve to swamp our ship of state. Our current course doesn't just threaten our future economy and quality of life, but also our long-term national security."

Mr. Speaker, I think we could talk about a lot of things tonight. We could talk about immigration. We could talk about just about anything, and it really doesn't matter as much as what I just read from David Walker. Because, by 2040, we will spend on entitlement spending, including Social Security and Medicare and interest, more than we have in revenue coming in. So that means by 2040, not that long from now, we will not have any money for education, we will not have any money for defense, we will not have any money for agriculture, we will not have any money for anything.

I think it is important. To solve a problem, we have to define a problem.

Unfortunately, the American people and many Members of Congress don't appreciate the situation we are in fully.

So I have introduced a piece of legislation. I think it has been cosponsored by the gentleman from Texas. It is called the Truth in Accounting Act. All that that does is require the Federal government to share with the American people and all Members of Congress fully the extent of our unfunded liabilities.

Today, our unfunded liabilities stand at \$46 trillion. Just a few years ago, in 2000, they were at \$20 trillion. So just over 5 years they have more than doubled.

When I go around my district and talk about fiscal issues and people say how big is the national debt, I say \$8.3 trillion. People are appalled. But to put this in perspective, we could fully pay off our national debt today and we wouldn't even come close to meeting our financial obligations. The \$46 trillion is money we know we owe. If the United States Government was a public company, it would have to disclose those unfunded liabilities.

I am the only Member of Congress that I am aware of that ever served as CEO of a publicly traded company. Because of that, I understand that if any public company in America accounted for its business the way the Federal government accounts for its business, the management team would be in jail.

Public companies are required to account a certain way to result in transparency and accountability. I think we should expect no less from the Federal government. So, again, the Truth in Accounting Act simply requires the Federal government in the annual financial reports to disclose the unfunded liabilities that this Nation faces.

Why I think it is so important is because the better understanding there is of our financial challenges, the better policy we can enact. Because until we can define the problem, we won't have serious efforts to solve the problem, and I think it is so critical that we don't pass along a debt to our children that they simply can't afford.

The analogy I use is Congress is kind of like the Levee Commission. If recent history has taught us anything, when a storm is coming, you must strengthen the levee. We know that the storm is coming. In fact, it is a Category 5 hurricane. By publishing our unfunded liabilities clearly and accurately, I think that we will see that the sirens will go off, that the American people will demand that we address this responsibly, and they will not reelect Members to this body that don't stand up and do the right thing and not pass it along to future generations or future Congresses.

I appreciate the gentleman bringing us down here tonight. I appreciate his leadership on these issues. Certainly as responsible Members of this body, we must address this sooner, rather than later.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his leadership. Anything called "truth in accounting" is going to be a very foreign topic in this body.

Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what we need. The analogy or the metaphor that the gentleman from Indiana used is truly an apt one. As great as the tragedy that Hurricane Katrina was, think how much greater a tragedy that would have been had we not seen the hurricane coming, had it been like that tsunami that hit in Asia, where people didn't see it coming, and tens of thousands perished.

We see this coming. But our challenge, Mr. Speaker, it is not coming tomorrow, it is not coming next week, but it is coming, and we have an opportunity to do something about it.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, going on the thing that the gentleman from Indiana spoke about, what does the future look like if we choose to do business as usual, if we choose to follow the Democrat's lead and just keep on spending and spending and taxing and taxing and taxing and spending?

Let me tell you. Former chairman Alan Greenspan said, "We are very short on time and we will have a very great difficulty in fully funding the existing system." He was referring to Social Security.

The liberal Brookings Institute, no bastion of conservative thought, has recently written, "Expected growth in these programs," referring to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, "along with projected increases in interest on the debt and defense, will absorb all of the government's currently projected revenue within 8 years, leaving nothing for any other program."

Like the gentleman from Indiana said, if we don't do anything, in a matter of time the Federal government will consist of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and nothing else. There will be no Border Patrol. There will be no student loans. There will be no veterans health care system. There will be no agricultural research. There will be no Federal Trade Commission. And the list goes on and on.

The same report said, "The authors of this book believe that the Nation's fiscal situation is out of control and could do serious damage to the economy in coming decades."

The General Accountability Office has said there is no way you are going to grow your way out of this problem, even though we have had very robust economic growth since we passed President Bush's economic growth plan. If we don't change our path, there will be an adverse effect on economic growth, quality of life and national security.

This is in the same report from the General Accountability Office, Comptroller General David Walker: "We are heading to a future where we will have to double Federal taxes or cut Federal spending in half."

□ 2030

Now Yogi Berra once said, if you find a fork in the road, take it. Mr. Speak-

er, we do not want to take this fork in the road. We want to back up and we want to get on the right road. Again, that is why this budget debate is so important in this budget vote.

Now, again, there will be different alternative budgets debated. But it is going to come down to one Democratic budget and one Republican budget. And the Democratic budget, again their answer is more spending and more taxing, taking more money away from families.

Every time you vote to increase a Federal program, you are taking money away from some family program. Now, let us talk a little bit about some more truths that need to come out. Well, number one, again, the Democrats will say that we have a huge deficit, and that is perhaps the only item we might agree with them on.

Yes, the deficit is too large. But the deficit is too large because we are spending too much, not because the American people are undertaxed. They will say that all of the President's tax relief from previous years has somehow contributed to this incredible national debt that the gentleman from Indiana referred to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the Treasury report of the latest tax revenues. And guess what it says? It says that as we have decreased the marginal tax rates, we actually have more tax revenue. It says it right here.

Last year, corporate income taxes were up almost 45 percent. Individual income taxes were up almost 15 percent. Again, we have lowered tax rates, and we get more tax revenue. And as we can see from this chart, Mr. Speaker, we saw declining revenue from the Federal Government, as we were in a recession back in 2002 and 2003.

And yet this body, this Republican leadership, cut tax rates for small businesses, for American families, and they work, and they save and they invest and they build. And guess what? Not only do we create more jobs and more hope and more opportunity; we have more tax revenue. More tax revenue.

We had a 5 percent increase in tax revenue from 2003 to 2004. We had a 15 percent increase in revenue from 2004 to 2005. And now at the beginning of 2006, tax revenue is up 6 percent. Again, we cut tax rates, and we have more tax revenue, and the American people need to be aware of this.

If you take away the tax relief, if the Democrats have their way and get their huge automatic tax increases on the American people, you are going to lose this extra tax revenue. And not only that, you are going to lose everything that the tax relief has brought.

Now, with the glaring exception of terribly high gasoline prices, which are clearly hurting all American families, I know they are struggling, they are struggling. Think how much more they would struggle, though, if they did not have jobs.

Under tax relief, we have 5 million new jobs that have been created in this

economy in just the last couple of years. Five million new jobless. We have had 30 consecutive months of uninterrupted job growth, and we have actually got unemployment down. The unemployment rate today is lower than the average of the 1970s, of the 1980s, and of the 1990s. And yet Democrats want to have a huge automatic tax increase and take this away.

Right now more Americans than ever own their own home. We have the highest rate of homeownership in the entire history of the United States of America. Household net wealth has now reached \$51 trillion, which is an all-time high.

Average hourly earnings grew, and pay rose by 3½ percent. Inflation continues to be low. Now, again, there is clear work that has to be done on the price of gasoline, and that is a grey lining in what otherwise would be a big silver cloud.

Now, some people might say, well, how do you give tax relief and create jobs? Well, it was not that long ago, Mr. Speaker, that I visited a small business in Jacksonville, Texas, in my district, in the 5th District of Texas.

Now, Jacksonville Industries is a business that is in the aluminum die cast business. And they employed 20 workers when I went to visit them. Now, before the President brought his economic growth program to Congress to pass, they were on the verge of having to lay off two workers because of competitive pressures.

But because of the tax relief measures, they went out and they bought a new piece of equipment. Now, I could not tell you what it is called. I do not precisely know what its mechanical function is, but I can tell you what the result is. The result is they bought this new piece of equipment, and it made them more competitive. It made them more efficient.

And, Mr. Speaker, guess what? Instead of laying off two people, they went out and hired three new people. They hired Roger, and they hired Jess, and they hired Victor, three people who could have been on unemployment. They could have been on welfare. They could have been on food stamps. And they could have been on Medicaid.

But thanks to tax relief that the Democrats want to take away with their huge tax increase, this one small business in Jacksonville, Texas, had five people now who put roofs over their head, who put food on the table, who are building a better future for their families. That is just one small business in one small town in Texas. And that is happening all over the economy.

Mr. Speaker, let me at this time yield back to my colleague from Indiana who knows a lot about job creation himself.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding again. And, you know, the story you just told I think can be told millions of times around the United States. Certainly

small businesses are the backbone of our economy. Something like, you know, well over half of the employees in this country work for small businesses, and something like 90 percent of the employers are small businesses in this country.

We were home a couple of weeks ago. I have a small business advisory council, and one of the members of that council was talking about the 179 expensing that you were referring to, that allows small businesses to go out and buy capital goods, and they can expense it so they can invest in their business, grow their business, create jobs, provide benefits, contribute to the local economy and the national economy all at the same time, which is kind of a neat thing.

The good news is that there is a bill that is offered by Mr. HERGER, a member of Ways and Means, that would expand 179 expensing and make it permanent, which I think is good pro-growth tax policy.

I also heard a quick story that I got from my small business advisory council. A small businessman that has a business in LaPorte, Indiana, used to have to go borrow money to pay for his taxes, which is kind of crazy.

Because then he would restrict his flow of capital, was limited in being able to make the investments in his company, because he had to go out and borrow money to pay his taxes. But once we passed, in 2003, the 179 small business expensing provision, he did not have to do that any more. And he has been able to invest that money in his business and grow his business.

Just going back to the tax chart you had up a second ago, you know, it is kind of funny that opponents of tax relief, mainly our friends on the other side of the aisle, say we cannot afford to have tax relief. But your chart shows clearly, and the statistics that you talked about, tax receipts up 15 percent in 2005, the deficit is actually down in 2005 by about \$100 billion, I think clearly shows that we cannot afford not to have tax relief to continue to have our economy grow.

Now, we can cite economic statistics all night long, and they are true, and they are relevant and they matter. But they probably do not matter to the guy without a job. But what does help the guy without a job is a growing economy, because when the economy grows, everybody has more opportunity; and what is important to do is to focus on the pro-growth policy that has resulted in those economic statistics.

And the pro-growth policies that have resulted in those economic statistics, I would say in large part, is the tax relief that was passed in 2001 and 2003, just like the section 179 expensing.

Now, when we talk about the deficit, there are only two ways to get a deficit. One is we tax too little. The other is we spend too much. And I do not know about the rest of the congressional districts around this country, I

do not think they are a whole lot different than the Second District of Indiana. The people in the Second District of Indiana do not feel like they are taxed too little. They think we probably spend too much.

And so we have to move from using our measurement of success, how much we spend, to how well we spend. We spend enough here in Washington. We do not prioritize enough.

And just going back for a second to the Truth in Accounting Bill, we see that our spending is getting more challenging as we go forward. Just recently, yesterday I think, there was a report issued that showed that the Social Security trust fund will be exhausted by 2040. That is 1 year earlier than was projected last year, and Medicare by 2018. And I think last year it was projected by 2020.

So every day we wait to start using the measurement of success, how well we spend, rather than how much we spend, the situation gets worse. And, again, the best way that we can solve problems is to define problems and making sure that the Federal Government shares a clear picture of our financial challenges with the American people. I think that will result in the American people demanding that their elected representatives quit playing the politics of no, quit saying what they are against and start saying what they are for.

We are not elected to be against stuff. We are elected to be for bipartisan practical solutions, and the Truth in Accounting Bill is a bipartisan bill. It is co-authored by JIM COOPER of Tennessee, a conservative Democrat, and MARK KIRK from Illinois, a moderate Republican.

I consider myself a conservative Republican. We may not agree on all of the answers, but we certainly agree on the problem. And we have to get to a bipartisan solution, and I certainly hope the American people send people to this body that will not avoid this problem and be part of the ostrich generation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to once again point out one of our earlier charts to show just what has happened to the family budget, which is this lower blue line. Median family income in America in the last decade has gone from roughly \$45,000 to \$62,000.

Well, what has happened to the Federal budget in this same time period? This red line. About \$1.6 trillion to \$2.5 trillion. Again, the Federal budget is outpacing the family budget.

Mr. Speaker, only families can pay for the Federal budget. There is no magical machine that creates wealth in Washington, D.C. It comes from hardworking families from Indiana, from Texas, and from all across America.

And the gentleman, the colleague I have from Indiana, brought up a very

good point. It is not how much money you spend in Washington that counts; it is how you spend the money.

Now, what we will again hear this week as we vote on the budget, and we have this annual budget vote and budget debate, we will be told that as a Nation we are not spending enough on education, we are not spending enough on housing, we are not spending enough on nutrition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be right. But the fundamental difference between the Republican budget and the Democrat budget is the Democrats want the Federal Government to do the spending. The Republicans want families to do the spending. And we know the difference.

Now, the Democrats will say that the Republicans are cutting the budget. Well, I have yet to see any single budget submitted that actually cuts Federal spending. Frankly, we can probably use one.

What we do, though, is the Republicans will moderate the growth of government, and the Democrats will not. I have looked up "cut" in Webster's Dictionary, and it actually means to reduce. What the Democrats call a cut is that some government program under the Republican budget will grow 3 percent next year and they want it to grow 6. And they call that a cut.

Mr. Speaker, that is simply not the truth. That is not the truth. And they act like there has been an underinvestment in the Federal Government. Well, just in the last 10 years, the international affairs budget has increased 89 percent. The agriculture Federal budget has increased 118 percent.

The Federal transportation budget has increased 83 percent. The Federal education budget 113 percent. Health, including Medicaid, 126 percent. And guess what? During that same time period, median family income only grew by 33 percent.

Again, in just the last 10 years, the growth of the Federal Government is twice that of the family budget. It is just an unsustainable growth rate. And it begs the question again, what kind of America do you want?

Mr. Speaker, we already have 10,000 Federal programs spread across 600 different government agencies. I do not think there is one person in America who can tell you what each and every one of those agencies does and what every single one of the bureaucrats who works there, what they do.

□ 2045

I mean, at some point you have to say how much government is enough, how much government do we want to pay for. The Democrats act like nothing good ever happened in America if it was not funded by the Federal Government. Like, if we did not have a Federal program, there would not be any boy scouts, there would be no soccer games, we would have no physician, no Red Cross, no ice cream. None of this would happen. Anything good that happens in America, according to the

Democrats, can only happen through the Federal Government.

But we have to remember, every increase in a Federal program, again, is a decrease in some family program. What the Republican budget is about is we want a Federal Government that does a few things very, very well and not a Federal Government that tries to do everything but does them quite poorly, and this is what this is about.

Another difference between these two budgets, again as we talked about, is the Democrats wanting to bring forth a huge tax increase upon the American people. They want to take away paychecks and replace them with welfare checks. Mr. Speaker, that is not compassion.

A compassionate society ought to be measured ultimately by the number of paychecks it produces, not the number of welfare checks that are produced, and with that, I yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, well, the gentleman brings up a great point.

The gentleman asked the question earlier, what kind of country do we want, what kind of America do we want? I think we also have to ask the question, what kind of government do we want?

When we talk about raising taxes, talk about raising revenue, which we have already learned that good pro-growth tax policy at lower rates actually increases Federal revenue, but you ask why would we raise taxes and what do we need to spend money on. I think it is important to recognize that we can actually have better government at a lower cost.

Every business in America and every family in America has to find a way to do more with less, find a way to be more efficient. For some reason, we do not think government can achieve the same standards. For some reason, we think the government does not have waste, fraud, and abuse.

Let me just share a couple of things with you. Recently, the Inspector General found that Social Security sent \$31 million worth of Social Security checks to dead people. That is money that did not go to help anyone.

They found in 2003 that the food stamp program spent \$1.1 billion in overpayments. That is with a B.

In 2001, the GAO reported and said about Medicare, there are no reliable estimates to the extent of improper payments throughout the Medicare program because they cannot audit their books, they cannot even tell the kind of financial controls they have.

In 2002, the Inspector General found that Medicare had \$12.3 billion in overpayments and in 2001 found they had \$12.1 billion. That is \$24.4 billion in Medicare payments that were improper, did not go to help anybody, did not go to help any seniors that needed Medicare, did not go to help any low-income Americans, simply was money wasted. I always ask, what is compassionate about wasting \$24 billion on

mismanagement when the money does not go to help anyone, when there are certainly people in this country that need government help, and why is it compassionate to ignore that, not address it and get better government at lower cost by simply applying the same management tools and techniques that every business in America has to follow?

Certainly, I hope the American people are more demanding upon us to give them a good return on their taxpayer dollar and not stand for \$24.4 billion being wasted in Medicare over a 2-year period of time.

I could go on for a long time. In 2001, HUD had overpayments of 10 percent of their budget alone. It is kind of depressing to keep going down this road. It is time that we find ways to have better government at lower cost, better management, better oversight; and I certainly appreciate, again, the gentleman bringing us here to highlight these issues because the more people understand, the more demanding they will be that we fix things and only elect people that will address these issues, not avoid these issues.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for bringing up that point because too often in this debate that we are having about the budget this week, Democrats act like if we would only take more money away from American families and send it to Washington, that somehow it will magically turn into love and happiness and kindness and all kinds of good things.

Yet, the Federal Government cannot account for \$24 billion that was spent in fiscal year 2003. It has just disappeared into thin air; and yet the Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

The Defense Department wasted \$100 million on unused flight tickets and never bothered to collect the refunds even though the tickets were refundable, and yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this?

The Federal Government spends \$23 billion annually on earmarks, also known as pork projects, such as the grants to the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, and, hey, I love rock and roll, but I am just not sure our taxes should pay for it, because most of the rock stars I have seen are doing quite well on their own, not to mention, of course, that earmark known as the Bridge to Nowhere, to be complemented now by the Railroad to Nowhere, \$23 billion.

That is another thing, Mr. Speaker, we will take up is earmark reform this week, which is very important that we do, because as our colleague in the other body from Oklahoma, Mr. COBURN, has said, earmarks are the gateway drug to the culture of irresponsibility. Yet, as we spend all this money on pork projects, Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

Again, as was pointed out, the Department of Housing and Urban Devel-

opment in 2001 lost 10 percent of their whole budget. How many families or how many businesses could still operate if they just lost 10 percent of their budget? It goes back to that truism that we are never as careful with other people's money as we are with our own. This is just inexcusable; and yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

Let us talk about duplication. We have 342 economic development programs at the Federal level. It begs the question, what does the Federal Government know about economic development? Small business people know. Entrepreneurs know. Families know. I am not sure what the Federal Government knows. We have 130 different programs serving the disabled, 90 early childhood development programs, 75 Federal programs funding international education and cultural exchange activities, and the list goes on and on.

So that could be 342 executive directors and 342 vice executive directors and the list goes on, and yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

Washington is spending \$60 billion annually on corporate welfare versus \$43 billion on homeland security. That does not make any sense, and yet Democrats want to raise our taxes to pay for more of this.

So again, Mr. Speaker, if we will just be smart, if we will decide that we need a Federal Government that is focused on a few items and do them very, very well, we can receive a brighter, brighter future for our children because if we do not, this is the future that we are facing. This is what is happening to spending today; and again, as we have used the comparison to a hurricane that is coming in our direction, right now revenues are roughly about 20 percent of our economy, a little bit less, but what is happening is that programs are far outstripping our ability to pay for them.

In just one generation, spending is due to more than double. Here is what is going to happen to revenues, but look at what happens to spending by the year 2040, and most of it is driven by Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid and interest on the national debt.

So, to some extent, it is a little bit like Charles Dickens' "A Christmas Carol." We are all familiar with that story with Scrooge, and we know how fearful the Ghost of Christmas yet to come, how fearful that spirit is.

Well, what is going to happen here in many respects is the ghost of Christmas yet to come. This is the future that our children and grandchildren are facing if we do not start today with a very simple choice between a Democrat budget and a Republican budget. It starts today, Mr. Speaker. We can decide that the Democrats are right that we are not spending enough money, notwithstanding the fact that every Federal program has grown precipitously over the family budget, notwithstanding the fact that we are on

this road to either have no Federal Government except for Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, or we are going to double taxes on the American people in one generation.

That is their vision of America. Our vision is one of limited government, better government, more effective government, one where our children and grandchildren still have an opportunity to use their God-given talents to roll up their sleeves, to work hard and to create the kind of future that they want for themselves. It is an America that is growing. It is an America that has more freedom, and this is what we see, and that is why these budgets are so different.

But the Democrats, again, want to keep this spending going. They want to have a tax increase.

Now, they do not like to talk about it. They like to point fingers at the Republicans; but let me tell you, for the last 10 years, every time the Republicans submitted a budget, the Democrat alternative budget spends even more, and they are pointing the finger of fiscal irresponsibility?

Mr. Speaker, I sit on the House Budget Committee, as does my colleague from Indiana, and we just marked up the budget. Every single Democrat amendment to the budget would have spent more money. They say the Republicans were fiscally irresponsible to provide a prescription drug benefit in Medicare, but guess what, Mr. Speaker? Their alternative plan spent even more money than the Republican plan.

It is just inconceivable that they can point the finger of fiscal irresponsibility when all they want to do is lead us to a future where taxes are double and an America where people do not create jobs, where people cannot afford to send their children to college, where people cannot find the capital to start new businesses, oh, but there will be plenty of welfare checks, and they will call that compassion. Compassion is about paychecks.

With that, I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Recently, I was having a conversation with a friend of mine that said when you are talking about tax policy, he said, well, maybe it would be a prudent thing to raise taxes. This person was in the financial services industry, and I said, let me ask you a question: you do research on businesses and you do research on a business where every year the company has increasing losses and increasing debt. The company has not passed an audit in 9 years. The management is ineffective at combating waste, fraud and abuse; and the only strategy the management team can come up with to turn the tide is to raise prices on their customers. Do you think that is a business you would invest in? He said, you know, you have got a point; I do not think that that would be a good investment.

So it is interesting when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle

say, well, gee whiz, we have got to raise prices on our customers to pay for our lack of proper management. I do not think that that is respectful to the American people, the American taxpayer, and certainly not a winning strategy.

I think the gentleman from Texas can wrap us up here; and, again, I thank him for bringing this very important subject to the floor tonight.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for joining us tonight. I certainly thank him for his courageous leadership in this body.

In these closing minutes we have, Mr. Speaker, what is it that we do about all of this? Well, several things. Number one, we need to reform the budget process that we have today. Now, it is not particularly sexy kind of stuff; but, you know, the machine we have that produces spending in Washington was manufactured back in the 1970s, back when Democrats were in charge in this body, and it is a spending machine. We need to go back and retool that to a savings machine for American families.

Number one, most American families do not realize this, but our budget does not even have the force of law. At best it is a mere suggestion. The legislation sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) would ensure that our budget, when you tell the American people here's the budget, we will enforce it as a law.

Second of all, we have got to cap the growth. I did not say a cut, but we have got to cap the growth of the Federal budget to roughly that of the family budget. Only then will programs have to compete against each other. Only then will you start to root out the waste, the fraud and the abuse and the duplication. Only then when you say, okay, this is all the money we are taking away from the American family and we will take away no more.

□ 2100

We need sunset commissions in the Federal Government. Again, as President Reagan once said, the closest thing to eternal life on Earth is a Federal program. Many have long since outlived their usefulness.

I just tripped across this one the other day. We are still funding Radio Free Europe; and, to the best of my knowledge, the Berlin Wall fell back in 1989. We need to eliminate this thing called baseline budgeting which allows people to artificially inflate budgets. It is the kind of stuff that would make an Enron and WorldCom accountant blush, yet here people get away with it in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we just balance the budget. It is time to balance the budget, and we need to do it without increasing taxes on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, certain principles transcend time. One of those principles is balancing the budget. Another principle is limited government. You can-

not have unlimited government and unlimited freedom. If you want unlimited government, Mr. Speaker, people ought to support the Democrat budget. If they want more welfare, if their greatest hope and aspiration is a Federal check, then people should support that budget. But if people want more freedom and if they want more opportunity and their aspiration is a paycheck with a great career where people can use their God-given talents and be everything that they can be, then they need to support this Republican budget, and we can have a brighter future for my children and for all the children in America for generations to come in this great and blessed land.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight before the country to discuss the state of our Nation and to talk about a few of the things that I think that we can do to improve the state of the Nation. This hour that we will have tonight, there will be some other members of the Blue Dog Coalition that will join me, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Blue Dog Coalition is a group of 37 men and women from all over the country, Democratic Members that believe that there are certain things that we should do as a government, certain functions that we should perform to make the economic model work well, and we should try to perform those functions well, and we should be willing to pay for it.

I was very interested in the previous speaker and actually agree with what some of the previous speaker said, and I think he wound up by saying that we ought to balance the budget.

The Blue Dogs, Mr. Speaker, could not agree more that that is a very important step, and I think most Members, most folks out in the country would understand the concept or the notion of balancing the budget, whether it is our individual home budgets or whether it is our business budget, whether it is our local governments. Eventually, you have to have revenues meet expenditures, or you do not stay in business too long. Most of us understand that. Except in the Federal Government, we have a difficult time understanding it sometimes, and I think we have not done very well on that front in the last 6 years certainly.

I was also interested in some of the comments made by the previous speaker. You would have thought that the Democrats were in control of the Congress of the United States. I would remind the Speaker that the White House, the House and the Senate are all controlled by the Republican party. When it comes to doing budgets and

programs and balancing those budget and programs, that is certainly within the control of the majority party to do that.

There also was a good bit of talk about the welfare program. Mr. Speaker, the welfare program was something that this Nation worked together on back in the 1990s under a Democratic President and Republican-led Congress, worked very hard, sat down in a bipartisan way and came up with a good solution to find ways to move people off of welfare and get them into the workplace.

The previous speaker is absolutely right in that we need people in the workplace, getting paychecks, being productive, paying taxes into a society, and that way our economy works best and our lives are better.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about three specific issues, three broad areas, basically, where I believe this administration and this Republican-led Congress have failed us in being responsible.

Number one is they have failed to balance the budget. For 5 consecutive years now, we have had a budget that is out of balance.

Number two, they have failed to manage our Federal Government and its functions effectively and efficiently. Let me say that again. They have failed to manage the Federal Government and its functions effectively and efficiently, and I want to talk specifically about that a little more.

Thirdly, I believe that this administration and this Congress has failed to uphold the standards of honesty and accountability when it comes to perform their functions.

Now, I want to start with the second of those particular bullet points and talk about the management of the Federal Government and point out some of the things that have been going on the last 5 to 6 years.

When President Bush took office, he told us and we all knew that he came from a business world and with an MBA and with the charge that the government would be run like a business. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have seen many of our Federal agencies managed by people with little or no experience. As a result, you find today 19 of the 23 Federal agencies are not in compliance with proper accounting standards. In other words, they cannot give a clean audit of their own actions in how and where they spent the money, the taxpayers' money that was given to them to perform their governmental function. What this means is that we cannot account for all of the government's assets and liability.

The previous speaker talked about the Department of Defense being the biggest offender; and, in actuality, the Department of Defense is the largest offender of this. Of course, the Department of Defense is one of the largest agencies in the Federal Government, the largest agency in the Federal Government, and we all know the high-pro-

file story of the over \$3 billion that was allocated, appropriated for Iraq reconstruction that nobody can account for. The Department of Defense cannot account for the over \$3 billion that was appropriated for Iraq reconstruction.

The complete lack of management and accountability in our Federal agencies is unacceptable. If you had a manager that operated like that in your local government or in a business, you would replace that manager. So I think that we really should demand more of our executive agencies in terms of management and accountability as it relates to how they spend the money that is appropriated to that particular agency.

In the 1990s, Mr. Speaker, Congress and the President, again a Democratic President, a Republican-led Congress working together in a bipartisan way enacted a series of reforms for the Federal civilian workforce known as the Readmission of Government. These reforms reduced the size of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, by over 300,000 employees.

Let me say that again. In the 1990s, the size of the Federal Government was reduced by over 300,000 employees.

Despite this reduction, many Federal agencies improved their performance substantially; and I want to talk about one of those Federal agencies specifically, I think, which is a good example. Because, Mr. Speaker, I come from Florida, and in Florida we are accustomed to natural disasters, primarily hurricanes that start about this time of year and run all the way through the summer and into the fall. Last year, I think we had so many hurricanes that we ran out of alphabetic names and had to start back through the alphabet a second time to name all the storms. I think there has been a lot of press and a lot of publicity about the storms that we have had.

Florida has created an excellent emergency management system to deal with those storms, but we always work hand in glove with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which is known as FEMA, and I found in my 18 years of public service in Florida that FEMA was one of the premier Federal agencies, really a professional agency that knew what its role was and knew how to get the job done probably more than any Federal agency I knew in the 1990s. It was the poster child, if you will, of a well-managed Federal agency. FEMA's structure was transformed, and three national response teams were created to quickly react to any national emergency. I guess in the 1990s, FEMA's performance was more notable for the newspaper stories that weren't written about it. Anytime you find an agency that is doing a good job, doing what it is supposed to be doing, then you do not hear much about it. Disaster victims and State officials alike, including myself, gave FEMA grade A marks, unanimous applause, if you will.

Now we fast-forward 5 years, 6 years, we find FEMA in response to Hurricane

Katrina an utter failure. Just last week or 2 weeks ago, you had a Senate committee with jurisdiction over FEMA stating that FEMA is so broken that that bipartisan committee, leadership of that committee, believes that it should be completely dismantled.

How did we go in the late 1990s or in the 1990s from an agency that was acclaimed to be the most efficient and effective Federal agency to an agency that is almost dysfunctional today? Why do we have so many problems with FEMA?

Well, maybe it is because the administration dismantled the three national response teams prior to Katrina, so there was no group of folks within FEMA ready to go at a moment's notice. Perhaps it was that FEMA was folded into a brand-new Department of Homeland Security and, by all accounts, became the dumping ground for the Department.

Whatever these reasons are, I think every one of them point back to a management style or scheme or capability. One factor that certainly played a role in the change was that in the 1990s FEMA was run by professionals with strong emergency management experience at the State and local level.

Let me say that again. In 1990, early 1990s, the previous administration brought in emergency management professionals with strong management experience at the State and local level, and they took FEMA and they transformed it into a world-class organization. However, under the current administration, until weeks ago, FEMA was run by political hacks with little or no emergency management experience.

It is clear that on the fiscal and management fronts that this administration is failing the American people; and, as a result, you have agencies which cannot produce clean audits. They cannot tell you where the money was spent, the taxpayers' dollars that we are appropriating, and what was done with it. And that is one of the points that I want to make.

The other point and the one I mentioned earlier was the balancing of the Federal budget. Now, the previous speaker spoke of that; and, actually, as I said earlier, we are in complete agreement, that the Federal budget should be balanced.

I see that we have been joined by one of our fellow Blue Dogs, Representative JIM COOPER from Tennessee. Mr. COOPER serves in a role in the Blue Dogs where he chairs the policy committee and, as a result, has the task of leading us in developing of our policy positions. Mr. COOPER has done a lot of work on these issues, fiscal responsibility.

□ 2115

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, I would like to call on my fellow Blue Dog from Tennessee, Mr. COOPER.

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's friendship

and leadership of the Blue Dog Coalition because we are perhaps the leading voice in Congress for fiscal restraint and fiscal responsibility.

The chart the gentleman has been referring to showing our national debt and each individual's share of the national debt is a truly scary document. But as the gentleman knows, I am afraid there are even scarier numbers in Washington than that because the debt figures that the gentleman is holding shows what the debt is according to a cash basis; and that is, unfortunately, a very weak form of accounting that is illegal for most businesses in America, certainly businesses of any size.

I want to put that in context for folks both in this Congress and back home because the numbers the gentleman referred to come from this document here, which is the President's budget. Every Congressman gets a hand-delivered copy of this. It is widely publicized in the media. It has a lot of good information in it, but it is the budget of the United States on a cash basis, counting dollars when they come in and go out.

There is another document which is even more important. It is almost secret. It is not classified secret, but it is even better than that. It was distributed on Christmas Eve without a press release by the United States Department of the Treasury. They only printed a thousand copies for all of America, so it is not exactly like they wanted everybody to read it. This is called the "Financial Report of the United States Government." It is issued by the Treasury Department and signed by Secretary John Snow, and it also gives a picture of our financial situation. But it does not use cash accounting; it uses modern accounting that all large corporations in America are required by law to use. So if you really want government to be run like a business, you pretty much have to use this document.

The gentleman referred to our MBA President, the first one we have had in American history, and how so many Americans expected him, with his MBA degree, to run our country like a business. But this is still a largely secret and ignored document.

Why would that be? Because the numbers in it are so grim.

Mr. BOYD. So do I understand it to be Federal law that any business over \$5 million has to use that accrual accounting procedure?

Mr. COOPER. That is exactly right. Modern accounting is required of all businesses in America with revenues over \$5 million. That basically says any business larger than, say, a single McDonald's would be required to use modern accrual accounting. And lest anyone not hear the word correctly, "accrual" has nothing to do with the word "cruel." In fact, accrual accounting is probably the kindest form of accounting because it remembers our elderly and sick and disabled. Cash accounting tends not to do that.

So modern accrual accounting is a very important innovation in accounting. All our businesses have used it for years. In fact, generally accepted accounting principles, GAAP accounting, really says that all businesses of every size should use accrual accounting because it is a more accurate picture of where we are.

As the gentleman knows, because he has a business background himself, the saying in business is if you can't measure it, you can't manage it. If you can't measure it, you can't manage it. That is what accounting does, it helps us measure our financial situation. This shows a picture of our financial situation. I hope it is clear.

Maybe I should come down to the gentleman's easel.

This is a very important chart because it shows us in clear perspective the difference between the budget numbers calculated on a cash basis and on an accrual basis. This top number of \$319 billion is the cash deficit for the year 2005. That is a lot of money. That is the third largest budget deficit in all of American history in absolute dollar terms. It is not quite the third largest in percent of GDP terms; but it is a huge, whopping number.

If you look down the chart, you will see if you do not count the borrowing from the Social Security trust fund, the true cash deficit for the year 2005 was \$494 billion, almost \$500 billion. That is still using the old-fashioned, antique cash accounting method.

If you use modern accrual accounting, according to the Treasury Department and the Bush administration, Secretary Snow says the deficit for 2005 was \$760 billion. That is starting to be a truly large number. That takes into account many of the obligations that we have in future years because what accrual accounting means, it takes into account when you use that national credit card to buy something. You have obligated yourself to buy something. It might have been pensions for our elderly, health care for our elderly, health care for the disabled, things that we know we are going to have to spend money on but we have not actually paid cash yet. That is the \$760 billion number; but that is not the scariest number on the chart.

Everybody in this body has said that they believe Social Security and Medicare are vitally important programs for our Nation and that those benefits should be preserved for our seniors and those who are going to be seniors. Guess what, folks. The accrual number, as good as it is, does not take into account Social Security and Medicare benefits. How could that possibly be? Well, the reason is under modern accounting methods you only take into account contractual obligations, and Social Security and Medicare are not contractual obligations. Congress retains the right to vary the benefits.

Because of that, those numbers are left out of this deficit calculation. So I

believe if you truly care about preserving Social Security benefits and Medicare benefits, as I do and most Members of Congress do, certainly on the Democrat side, you have to look at these other numbers because the budget deficit for 2005 actually goes up to \$1.7 trillion if you include the anticipated Social Security benefits that we are going to have to pay in the incremental increase of 1 year.

If you add Medicare to that, the true budget deficit for 2005 was an astronomical \$2.7 trillion.

I am indebted for these last two numbers to the professor of law and accounting at Harvard Law School, a gentleman named Howell Jackson who did these calculations. And they are still in draft form and subject to some refinement. But it is the first time we have really taken the numbers that originally professors at the Wharton School of Business and a business economist in Washington, D.C. have helped put together. Those gentlemen are Kent Smetters and Jagadeesh Gokhale. Those gentlemen have shown America and the world that our true unfunded liabilities are astronomical. If you look out a few decades, they are on the order of \$49 trillion to \$67 trillion.

So it is a situation where if you are just trying to measure it so you can manage it. Look at one year's annual deficit: you will see that the number we are given by the administration of \$319 billion is probably not an accurate number. In fact, it is probably only one-tenth of the true size of the deficit because if you believe in Social Security and Medicare, as I do, you have to take into account the obligations that we are incurring on an annual basis to fund those programs.

These numbers are huge, Madam Speaker, because even this number of \$760 billion, that is a deficit for the year that is greater than most all of the discretionary spending of the Federal Government. That is greater than the entire defense budget and greater than all of the road programs, agricultural programs, parks, recreation, arts, all of the things that the Federal Government is involved with. So that is a large number. But this number down here of \$2.7 trillion, that is greater than the total Federal budget of the United States.

Madam Speaker, I think we should look at these accounting numbers, these facts, these fiscal facts so that men and women of goodwill all across America can evaluate our situation. As I said earlier, if you can't measure it, you can't manage it.

This should not be a partisan issue. I am taking these figures primarily from administration documents. This is a reality that I especially think all of our business people should pay attention to. The Tennessee bankers were in today. I acquainted them today with all of these numbers, and we had a number of Tennessee insurance agents visiting today. Unfortunately, our media have not seen fit to do many stories on these numbers. Perhaps they

are too large for the media to understand. I think it is very important for America to focus on this. What they really spell is a crisis for our country.

We are borrowing so much of this money; and we are not just borrowing it from ourselves, we are borrowing it from foreign nations.

I am proud to stand with my friend from Florida who is a great leader of the Blue Dog cause. It is very important that we get the word out on these facts.

There are many different ways to measure it. JOHN TANNER from Tennessee points out that it took 204 years of American history to borrow our first trillion dollars. That is 204 years, all of the way from George Washington through almost Jimmy Carter to borrow \$1 trillion. Then we started on this pace where we are borrowing a trillion dollars now almost every 18 months, something that it took us 204 years to do before. That is unsustainable, to put it politely. It is crazy if you use more normal language.

There are other things that are going on that are worrisome. Under President Bush's administration, we have borrowed more money than all previous presidencies in America put together. President Bush is our 43rd President, and that means he has borrowed more money than our first President, George Washington, all of the way through our 42nd President, Bill Clinton. That is an amazing thing. And it is not just borrowing in general; it is borrowing from foreign nations. We have borrowed more money from foreign nations today than all previous Presidents in American history.

I am hoping that men and women of goodwill across this country will focus on some of these accounting facts. Maybe ask a little more of your newspapers and TV stations back home to get more real news because I think this will do more to determine the future of our kids and grandkids than anything else we talk about on the floor of Congress, because when you run deficits like this, that means you accumulate debt and that debt carries a high interest rate, and that interest simply must be paid.

That is the one tax increase that can never be repealed, and those debt costs are mounting every year. Petty soon the debt that we are having to pay our creditors, many of whom are foreign, is getting to be so large it is almost larger than the entire defense budget of the United States.

So it is a crisis, Madam Speaker. It is something that we must deal with, and I hope that our colleagues will pay more attention to these issues.

We understand that next week the budget is supposed to come up for a floor vote. They were unable to pass a budget a few weeks ago. It is vitally important that not only do we have a budget, but we have a budget that reflects reality. The budget that will be brought to the House floor will not reflect these true numbers. They will

still be focused on the cash numbers with inadequate accounting.

However, I was able to get passed in the Budget Committee unanimously, House Democrats and Republicans, an amendment that said for next year we will start using the more accurate, accrual-based numbers. I think that is progress. Accrual will not replace cash budgeting, but at least you will be able to refer to both sets of numbers as we do the budget so that you can see what our true fiscal situation is.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Florida for yielding. He has been a great leader of the Blue Dogs for a long time now, and I appreciate his leadership, and together I think we can continue to make progress on these issues.

□ 2130

Mr. BOYD. Thank you, Mr. COOPER.

A couple of things that you said struck me. One is, unsustainable; and the other is, we have to work together. Those of us who have been in this business, those of us who have any kind of accounting training in our background understand that those sorts of numbers, first of all, that reporting procedures, or those reporting procedures, are wrong; and the trend there of red ink, deficit spending, is unsustainable. It will be, and I think the public will recognize it when the markets begin to react to their fears that someday, if America doesn't turn around its habit or change its habit of deficit spending, that it will have difficulty sustaining itself economically.

The other thing that struck me about what you said is what I call the bipartisanship thing. I want to go to this chart here, and this talks about the budget deficits from 1982 to 2006, a 24, 25-year period, starts with President Reagan back in 1982. And you see the minus numbers here, all the way down through the fourth year of the Clinton administration, or fifth year of the Clinton administration, in which, working together right in here, a Republican-led Congress and a Democratic President worked together for the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which then produced a positive result that got the country back on the right track, at least in terms of its cash basis deficit issue.

So you see that that was a very positive thing here.

And the biggest issue we had in 2001, when President Bush was sworn into office, was how do we deal with the \$5.6 trillion, 10-year projected surplus we had. We had a \$5.6 trillion, trillion, now, projected surplus in 2001.

Many of us, especially of those of us in the Blue Dogs said, hey, there are several things we can do. Number one is we ought to address these priorities related to Medicare and Social Security. We know those programs have long-term problems. Let's spend part of the money there. Let's use part of it to give back in tax breaks and let's use part of it to pay down this huge Federal debt that we had.

But this Congress and this administration decided not to follow that sort of three-pronged approach, debt reduction, deal with Medicare and Social Security, and tax relief. Instead, they poured all the money into tax relief. And then immediately you see what happened. You had 9/11 come after that and an economic downturn, and then now we have got deficits.

We have structural deficits. What does a structural deficit mean? It means that even if the economy works, everything works like it is supposed to, you are still going to have a deficit. You are still spending more money than you take in. That is wrong. That is fundamentally wrong. And we ought to, we have to correct it. We just can't afford to let it go on like this.

America is the greatest country on the face of the earth economically, politically, militarily. We won't be that way long if we don't fix this very dangerous structural deficit that we have.

We have been joined by another outstanding member of the Blue Dog Coalition. We come from all over the country. We have with us tonight Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ from California who has joined us now. She has been a leader. She is a member of the Armed Services Committee and a leader there; and I would like to yield at this time to my friend, LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Thank you so much, Mr. BOYD. I just am very grateful that you decided to take this hour to talk a little bit about the financial crisis, really, that our United States is in, and what we can do or what we must do in the near future to begin to get our financial house in order of our Nation.

As you know, I am an economist by training and a former financial advisor and investment banker for 12 years before I came to the House of Representatives; and besides sitting on the Armed Services Committee and the Homeland Security Committee, I also sit on the Joint Economic Committee for the Congress, the economic committee that looks at the macro picture of what is going on in the United States.

And, quite frankly, we take a look at our position vis-a-vis the rest of the countries of the world. In other words, how are we going to hold on to our financial status, our quality of life, our way of life as we know it? And I believe, every night when I go to sleep, I believe that this is the biggest issue that is facing us here in Washington, D.C., and as Americans.

Earlier, Mr. COOPER showed a chart that said that we are telling the American people, this Congress, this Republican-led Congress is telling the American people that, in this coming year, our shortfall or what we are overspending by for the year will be \$319 billion. And it says it right there.

But the reality is, take aside our responsibilities that we have told people we are going to do for Medicare and Social Security for the future, the reality

is that we spend much more than \$319 billion this year. Without that Medicare and Social Security responsibility, we really spend \$760 billion more than the money we take in.

Now we sat down a while ago with the Comptroller of the United States as a Blue Dog Coalition, and he said to us that 70 percent of the deficit that we have on an annual basis is because we are not collecting the taxes we should be collecting from the American public. In other words, with the three sets of tax cuts that were given by President Bush and the Republican Congress, we have failed to take in the money we need to pay our bills. What we are basically doing is borrowing to pay, and at some point that comes due.

It is like putting it on a credit card. At some point, the credit card company will come and tell you, okay, you have got to pay up. And, as you know, it becomes much more difficult than to have paid it as you went along.

We, as Blue Dogs, believe that we should do pay as you go, that we should make tough decisions every year and decide how we are going to spend and how we are going to tax and bring in the monies we need, how we are going to cut spending, if we need to cut spending. But we haven't been allowed to do that. Each and every year, as Blue Dogs, when we get together and we make our budget and we think about it, Mr. COOPER, on the Budget Committee, others of us, and the reality is that every year the Republicans decide that it is not the year to get our house in order, our financial house in order.

Now, you know, there are some things that people haven't even begun to think that will impact even more our deficit spending over the inability for us to pay our bills on an annual basis and, therefore, put it on the credit card.

The Medicare part D, the prescription drug program that the Republicans voted in 2 years ago, okay, it hasn't gone very well. We all know that. We all wonder what they are doing with it, et cetera. They said it would cost \$400 billion over 10 years. This is extra that they were going to spend. We now know it is going to cost at least \$1.5 trillion if we meet the responsibility of that program. That is not factored into the budget deficit that we see coming in the future.

Hurricane Katrina, that is not factored in. We have done really very little. We have already given about \$83 billion towards Hurricane Katrina, but the two Louisiana senators from that State have a bill that says they want us to spend almost \$300 billion more just for Louisiana to get the place fixed up. That is not counted in the deficits we see for the future.

And the Iraq war, \$1.5 billion a week of spending. How long is it going to take? We are already approaching almost \$400 billion spent on that war by the end of this year. And I sit on that committee, the military committee. I

don't think we are going to be out by the end of the year.

You do the math. \$1.5 billion a week. That is the operating cost of being bogged down in Iraq. Will it be 3 years, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years? Korea, at 50 years?

Start adding up those numbers, America, and you will understand why we, the Blue Dogs, are so concerned that the Republicans will not take this seriously and sit down with us and hash out what we need to do in order to begin to get this under control.

That is why I am grateful that you have come down here today to talk about this, Mr. BOYD.

Mr. BOYD. I thank the gentlewoman from California for your leadership on these areas and particularly on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to add a note to what the gentlewoman from California said talking about pay as you go. That is a policy that former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said would be the single most important thing we could do in Congress to help get our fiscal house in order. Alan Greenspan saying the single most important thing we could do to get it in order.

Because Chairman Greenspan and most other economists know that PAYGO worked very well from 1990 when it was first put in place, until 2002, when the Republican majority allowed it to expire. Chairman Greenspan can even remember the day and the hour that PAYGO was allowed to expire, because he knew then that our Nation was risking serious trouble.

But we have not really been allowed to vote on bringing back pay as you go. It is a shame, because that pay as you go policy forces Congressmen to make responsible decisions. You cannot increase spending unless you find offsetting cuts somewhere else, and you cannot reduce taxes unless you find some way to pay for it. It is very sensible. It is the sort of policy we all have to do in our own household expenses, and our Nation was doing so well with it for 12 years, from 1990 to 2002. But, since 2002, we have not had PAYGO, and that is one reason you are seeing these terrifically high deficits.

Mr. BOYD. If the gentleman would yield.

I know the gentleman served in Congress prior to 1994 and is actually on his second trip back and was not here in 1997 when we did the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. But Congresswoman SANCHEZ and myself were. And one of the keys to that 1997 Balanced Budget Act which led us to balancing the budget here in this era was PAYGO.

Spending caps was another key element of that. You put caps on spending programs, and you leave them there, and you agree upon that. Those are not here anymore, as you know, under this administration, this Republican-led Congress and Republican administration. Back then, it was President Bill

Clinton, a Democrat, Speaker Newt Gingrich, a Republican, and Majority Leader of the Senate, TRENT LOTT, a Republican, sat together and said how do we do this in a bipartisan way. You don't have any of that at work anymore.

I think that is the thing that disappoints me more than anything, is I know that there are people of goodwill that would work in good faith all over this country that serve in this body that don't have that opportunity because we are not allowed to sit down. The majority party in many cases just won't sit down with us and work together to solve these problems. So these are very, very difficult solutions.

I know the chart that showed the accrual accounting and the \$2.7 trillion deficit, those are hard numbers to understand. Here is one that is not hard to understand. This is what you actually owe today. We owe as a government today \$8.352 trillion. That is trillion with a T. \$28,000 for every man, woman and child. That is what our debt is today. And somebody has to pay that back. We also have to pay the interest on that. We have to service that debt on a regular basis. And as the interest rates go up, then, obviously, that is what I call a debt tax which cannot be repealed. It has got to be paid.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield.

He is exactly right. Those numbers are much clearer than the numbers I gave, because every American can look at that \$28,000 and say that is what I owe. That is what my spouse owes. That is what each of my kids owes.

But if the gentleman would like the modern accounting comparison for those numbers, under accrual accounting, each American today owes \$156,000 apiece, \$156,000 for every man, woman and child in this country. And that would mean for a family of five, that is almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$1 million. That is a luxury house anywhere in America, the cost of a luxury house. And yet we don't get to live in the house. We just get the mortgage. And that is on top of our real house and our real expenses and car payments and rent and all those things we have to pay.

□ 2145

So it is a terrific and crushing financial obligation that has been put on us just in the last few years.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, the fact is that some future Congress and some future President has a lot of hard, tough work to do, a lot of painful decisions to make to get us back in balance. It will be done somewhere down the road. We know that will happen, but it is going to be very painful.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the other problem is that as soon as we focus, and we must focus, on beginning to figure out how we pay this down, we need to do that. We have explained why. But the

reality is that when we are doing that, that is less money in our pockets, if you will, to be able to educate our children, to educate ourselves, to invest in roads and water systems and sanitation systems and what makes America productive vis-a-vis the rest of the countries of the world.

I can guarantee you that this debt is held to a large extent by countries around the world, Japan and China, the European countries. They are who we owe. And they are looking at ways of how do they increase their quality of life. And they are investing in education. They are investing in water systems. When we have to pay this down, we will not be able to make that investment.

Mr. BOYD. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman makes a good point. In the past when we had to run up debt, for instance, during World War II and at other times in a national emergency, that debt in large part was bought by Americans. That financing was provided by Americans. That is not the case today. Of this over almost \$3 trillion that has been borrowed since January 2001, the great bulk of it, the majority of it, has been lent to us by China and Japan. So in most cases, foreign countries, some not necessarily that are friendly to our cause, are lending us this money.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman would yield, many Blue Dogs have asked where are the war bonds for the Iraq war. Because during World War II, we had war bonds and it was a patriotic obligation, if you could afford to, to lend money to our government to conduct the war. The administration has not asked for war bonds for Iraq. Nor have we asked for Katrina bonds. That would be a great way that Americans could show their support. I saw in the newspaper today that a Middle Eastern country, Qatar, has offered to pay millions of dollars to New Orleans. There should be an effort for the American people to lend ourselves the money we need to get through this. Instead, we run up \$1 trillion of debt with China. Already many countries have gigantic amounts. You may have seen the cartoon. When the President of China, Hu Jintao, came to visit a couple of weeks ago, there was a cartoon in the paper where there was a little balloon out of the White House saying, "Oh, our landlord's here." When you start lending money on that scale from China to the United States and we have to pay that back to China, that almost means that we are beholden to them, and that is a very dangerous security risk for our country.

So I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. BOYD. I appreciate both of you folks being here today.

One last thing that I wanted to talk about, the third point that I wanted to make, was the issue of honesty and accountability by the administration. We have to deal with the American people in all areas, and particularly our finan-

cial area, with honesty, and we have to be accountable. On the congressional side, our forefathers designed our system so that the congressional side would have an oversight role, that we would make the laws and appropriate the money, and our job was to make sure that the executive branch, the President and the executive agencies, spent the money and applied the laws in the way that we intended them to be. And I do not think that is happening as well as it should these days. And I want to cite a couple of examples.

An article in Monday's Boston Globe reports that the administration has disregarded more than 750 laws enacted since he took office, adopting the policy that basically the administration has the authority to pick and choose a provision of which laws that they wish to follow. This is a blatant disregard for the way our forefathers set up our Federal Government and has really upset the balance between the branches of government, and it has prevented Congress from carrying out our responsibility of lawmaking and oversight.

Let me cite an example of oversight abdication: from 1994, when President Clinton sat in the White House and the congressional House and the Senate were controlled by Republicans, there were over 1,000 subpoenas issued from 1994 to 2000, over 1,000 subpoenas issued to appear before House committees, under oath, to justify and explain actions of the administration. It is a role that Congress should be playing, an oversight role.

Since January of 2001, there have been virtually no subpoenas issued by this House to this administration to explain their actions. And Congress has basically abdicated its oversight role. And as a result, you see misuse of power and some corruption springing up in places, and I think we will see more of that unless Congress steps up and exercises its role of oversight over the executive branch.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, but part of the reason of why no subpoenas have been issued is that this House is controlled by the same party that controls the White House. And the Democrats, my party, we are not allowed to issue a subpoena. A subpoena can only be issued by the consent of the chairman of a committee, and that chairman would be a Republican. And, believe me, I have had a lot of questions and a lot of things I have wanted to ask the administration and its Departments with respect to some of their spending. I am not allowed to do that. NANCY PELOSI is not allowed to do that. It must be done by a Republican, and they have refused to subpoena. This is one of the reasons why there have been no subpoenas basically issued out of the House.

Mr. BOYD. That is a great point, and I thank the gentlewoman for making it.

Madam Speaker, we have been joined by my good friend and fellow Blue Dog

from Tennessee, Representative LINCOLN DAVIS, and I yield to my friend now.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Congressman BOYD, thank you for yielding. I deeply appreciate your efforts and the gentlewoman from California and my good friend from Nashville, Tennessee, for the comments that you have been making and trying to make this Congress, this House, and those who may be observing us, aware of the situation that we are in.

In the mid-1990s, I was amazed and somewhat taken aback and, quite frankly, somewhat was in agreement with the contract that was proposed by a group of individuals on September 27, 1994. And I looked at most of those and I thought that sounds just like a Southern Democrat in what they would propose. I am going to read some of those to you.

I am a general contractor, and I do not do much work anymore. Our job sure does not allow us to do that; so, therefore, I am not out building as I was through the 1990s and the 1980s and the early part of the 21st century. But when I signed a contract with someone, there were certain ordinances in that that said you have to abide by these or else if you do not, we will take over that contract and we will hire somebody else or put someone else in your place that will fulfill those commitments that you have made. And I would sign a payment of performance bond that would do exactly that. So I felt that any contract that you made with this country, it was a contract that was binding. So I want to read some parts of the contract.

Item No. 2, it says on the first day we will "select a major, independent auditing firm to conduct a comprehensive audit of Congress for waste, fraud, and abuse." We cannot even audit several of our different Departments and agencies of the Federal Government today. This was a pledge in 1994.

I look at something else here. It says we "guarantee honest accounting of our Federal budget by implementing zero base-line budgeting." In the Tennessee legislature, we understood what that was. Apparently, the folks who agreed to sign this contract did not, and the rest of the story, as some famous person says, is still being told.

Then I take a look at No. 6, the National Security Restoration Act: no U.S. troops under U.N. command and restoration of the essential parts of our national security funding to strengthen our national defense and our credibility around the world." When I go to other countries, I am sometimes frightened, not that I am an American, because when God put my soul in the body of a woman who lived in America at conception and let me be born an American, it was one of the greatest blessings I could receive. But other folks I do not necessarily agree with. I think they misinterpret the American people and how they have a lack of respect for us. I do not like that and I

want us to change that, and I think foreign policy can make a difference. So I think that those are failures.

Our national defense, September 11 happened after 1994. I am not blaming anyone there, but I am just saying we need to start thinking in this country.

Another one said "term limits to replace career politicians with citizen legislators." We have a Senator who ran from Tennessee and said he would serve 12 years. I applaud BILL FRIST for not running again. I do not necessarily always agree with him, nor do I disagree with him a lot. But one thing I do agree with him on: he kept his word. We may not have passed the bill. But, quite frankly, the bill does not require you to keep your word. My father always said if you are honest, you will be rewarded; if you are dishonest, you ultimately will be punished and will lose.

Here is something else: "a balanced budget and tax limitation amendment and a legislative line-item veto." I have been here for a little over 3 years. I have never seen either one of these items that these folks who signed the contract, as I would sign as a builder, have tried to pass. Again, if you were back in Tennessee and if you were working for a developer, the first thing that would happen is they would say you have broken your contract; so we will take it over and get somebody else to finish the job. I think the American public needs to understand that, that when you give your word, your word is your bond.

I travel my district, all 24 counties, and, quite frankly, there is no conversation about \$3 a gallon of gasoline, very little. There is very little conversation about a \$1,000 per month-plus for health care; very little conversation about the huge deficits that we have today; very little conversation about the war in Iraq, where we have lost 2,500 young men and spend \$100 billion a year, approximately, in that country. But we played a little game one day as I played when I was a kid in school. We called it tag. In essence, you have to tag somebody else out so they can chase the other folks until ultimately they capture someone, and then they have to start running someone down. So I said let us kind of play tag. If you were President, what would you do?

An older fellow in the back said, No, Congressman. We have elected you. If you were the President, what would you do?

I said the first thing I would do for this country is I would audit this country. I would get the best CPAs, the most honest, the most knowledgeable, and I would audit every Department, every agency. I would look at every no-bid contract to find out how much profit was made. I would audit this country, and I would tell the American public why in 2001 we had 200-plus billion dollars in surplus and why now we have 300-plus billion dollars in deficits. So I would audit America. I would find out and tell the folks, this is where the

money went. This is where your money went. It is your money and here is where your money went.

And the next thing I would do, I would call up at Andrews Air Force Base and I would have them cap off Air Force One with fuel. I would get 10 of the best pilots in the Navy. I would also get 10 of the folks who can speak Arabic really well, and I would load them up, and we would have a nonstop flight to Kuwait. And I would tell the folks in Kuwait, remember about 10 years ago when you were invaded by this fellow named Saddam Hussein, or almost 15 years ago, and you came to the world's stadium and platform and said, Please help us. We have got 600,000 people, and a 25 million population country and their leader, Saddam Hussein, has just invaded us and they have taken over our oil fields, and the rest of the world came to your rescue.

I would get the sheiks. I would get the mullahs and the emirs and whatever they call themselves, the royalty, the folks who inherit the position, and I would say \$3-a-gallon gas is breaking the back of every woman and every man who is working in my district.

□ 2200

That is our worst enemy. We have conquered your enemy. You help with ours now.

I would go to Saudi Arabia and some of those folks, and I would tell them the same story. Then I would go to Iraq and put the troops there that was needed to put production back in those oil fields up to 3.5 million barrels a day that was there when Oil for Food was a policy that we criticize now so much. And certainly the dishonesty of it should be criticized. But I would put back on line those oil wells.

What that does for us is to help us balance our budget. Instead of us spending \$100 billion of American taxpayer money, HAROLD FORD, a candidate for the U.S. Senate, says that the American taxpayers are footing the bill for both sides in this war. As we pay \$3 a gallon gasoline, we are helping the insurgency get money, especially from some of their buddies in Saudi Arabia, and other places fund their insurgency through the dollars that go in and go back out to the radical groups of Islam. And then American taxpayers are paying for the American troops that are sacrificing their lives there.

I would put on line the oil fields in Iraq and get them producing more than 1.5 to 1.9 million barrels a day, and I would bring the revenue in to where the American taxpayers would have to quit paying for the cost of the war in Iraq.

I know our time is about ended. I have a whole lot more I would like to talk about. The point I want to make is that in this country today, we have a battle on our hands.

If you notice, I am not mentioning a word on the other side, their name. It saddens me when folks come to this

floor and they want to criticize Democrats and Republicans. We are all adult and mature individuals. It is time we started acting like Americans instead of Democrats and Republicans.

It is my hope we can start working together and take this bitterness away. Bipartisanship is the only thing that is going to solve this thing. In the Rules Committee, when we are not allowed to introduce amendments, I just got a news release that went out, and I will mention this because it is from the National Republican Committee.

"DAVIS Shares Blame for High Gas Prices.

"National Democrats are desperate to gain traction on any issue they can in the lead up to the 2006 elections. As gas prices across the Fourth District rise, so does the Democrat rhetoric. What Representative LINCOLN DAVIS probably hasn't mentioned though is that he voted twice against helping consumers feel less of a pinch at the pump."

They mention resolution number 519 and number 145, the Gasoline for America's Security Act and the Energy Conservation, Research and Development Act.

You realize that Republican Senator BILL FRIST wouldn't even put this bill up on the Senate floor because it didn't do what it said it did? So, in essence, even the Republicans in the Senate disagreed with those who voted in this House on this bill. That is the kind of truth you get from the truth squad when they come up and start talking.

Mr. BOYD, Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman. He brings a lot of common sense and wisdom.

I know our time has expired, Madam Speaker. I just want to conclude by saying that I hope that you understand that the Blue Dogs are a group of men and women who are ready to work together across the aisle in a bipartisan way to solve these problems. We have some very, very tough problems, and we have a group of folks who are ready and willing to roll up our sleeves and go to work, and let's solve some of these problems.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Madam Speaker, that doesn't say Blue Dog Democrats. It says Blue Dog Coalition. Republicans can join it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4954, SECURITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR EVERY PORT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. BOYD) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-450) on the resolution (H. Res. 789) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4954) to improve maritime and cargo security through enhanced layered defenses, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a Concurrent Resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a Concurrent Resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1003. An act to amend the Act of December 22, 1974, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should posthumously award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Leroy Robert "Satchel" Paige.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Foxx). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for half of the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I have here in my hands two pretty big reports that were paid for by our government and have for reasons that it is difficult for me to understand been pretty much ignored apparently by the organizations that paid for them.

The first of these is a big report paid for by the Department of Energy called *The Peaking of World Oil Production: Impacts, Mitigation and Risk Management*. This is generally known as the Hirsch Report, because the project leader was Dr. Robert Hirsch from SAIC, a very prestigious scientific and engineering organization. This report is dated February, 2005.

For reasons that we are trying to find, this was bottled up, apparently, inside the Department of Energy, because it didn't become publicly available until several months after that.

The second report I have here is the report by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This obviously is paid for by the Army. It is dated September of 2005, and it was just about 2 months ago that it finally got out of the Pentagon into the public. This one is called *Energy Trends and Their Implications For U.S. Army Installations*. I would submit that wherever they mention "Army," you could substitute "the United States" and it would be completely appropriate.

What I would like to do for the first few minutes is to look at some of the comments and recommendations in these two reports; and I would like to keep asking the question, why have these two government agencies which paid for these reports done essentially nothing to promulgate this information across the country? Rather, it would seem that there was an intent to keep this information from the public, because the Hirsch Report was bottled

up inside the Department of Energy for several months, and the Army Corps of Engineers report is dated September of 2005, and it says on the cover here, "Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited." But there was essentially no distribution of that until just about 2 months ago.

As you will see, Madam Speaker, if the content of these two reports is correct, if their observations and recommendations are correct, you would have expected these two government agencies to be using every vehicle at their disposal to get this information out to the public.

Let's look first at a few quotes from the Hirsch Report. The first here says, "The peaking of world oil production presents the United States and the world with an unprecedented risk management problem. As peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically," oil was almost \$75 a barrel today, "and without timely mitigation, the economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented."

"Viable mitigation options exist on both the supply and demand sides, but to have substantial impact they must be initiated more than a decade in advance of peaking."

A little later we will talk more about this. I am not sure that this is exactly the way that I would have articulated our challenge. We will talk about that a little later.

"Dealing with world oil production peaking will be extremely complex, involve literally trillions of dollars and require many years of intense effort."

Now another quote from this Hirsch Report. "We cannot conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules so as to incorporate higher energy efficiency technologies into the privately owned transportation sector. Significant improvements in energy efficiency will thus be inherently time-consuming, of the order of a decade or more."

If we are talking about transportation, Madam Speaker, that is indeed true. Because the average automobile and small truck is in the fleet about 17-18 years and the average 18-wheeler about 28 years. So any improvements that we ever make, we are making in energy efficiency in automobiles and trucks, is going to take quite some time to show any meaningful effect because of how long they are in the fleet.

Now a third quote from the Hirsch Report. Madam Speaker, I would like us to keep in our mind the question, if this is true and we have two reports, as you will see, that have reached essentially the same conclusion, we have no reason to believe there was any collusion between them. Indeed, their dates of publication are quite different, February to September. And if these observations and recommendations in these reports are in fact correct, then one might wonder why haven't these agencies been using every vehicle at their

disposal to get this information out to the American public and to initiate programs to deal with these problems?

"World oil peaking is going to happen. World production of conventional oil will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum is called the peak. A number of competent forecasters project peaking within a decade. Others contend it will occur later. Prediction of the peaking is extremely difficult because of geological complexities, measurement problems, pricing variations, demand elasticity and political influences. Peaking will happen, but the timing is uncertain."

Then this, Madam Speaker, a very significant statement. "Oil peaking presents a unique challenge," they say, and then this statement. "The world has never faced a problem like this. Without massive mitigation more than a decade before the fact, the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary. Previous energy transitions, wood to coal and coal to oil, were gradual and evolutionary. Oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary."

Now I would like to read a few of the quotes and recommendations from the Corps of Engineers study just out about 2 months ago, although the date was September of last year.

"Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost. The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as the frontline energy source for the industrialized world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then. Oil's many advantages provide 1-1/3 to 2-1/2 times more economic value per million BTUs than coal. Currently, there is no viable substitute for petroleum."

Madam Speaker, that is a startling statement. If in fact the world is peaking in oil production and there is no viable substitute for petroleum, wouldn't you think that the agencies paying for these studies would have used every vehicle available to them to get this word out to the American public and to articulate a rational program for dealing with this emergency?

"Oil prices may go significantly higher," they say, "and some have predicted prices ranging up to \$180 a barrel in a few years." Just under \$75 today, \$180 a barrel in a few years.

"In general, all non-renewable resources follow a natural supply curve: Production increases rapidly, slows, reaches a peak and then declines at a rapid pace, similar to its initial increase. The major question for petroleum is not whether production will peak, but when. There are many estimates of recoverable petroleum reserves, giving rise to many estimates of when peak oil will occur and how high the peak will be. A careful review of all of the estimates leads to the conclusion that world oil production may peak within a few short years, after which it will decline." Campbell and Deffeyes, several references here.

Let me digress for just a moment. One of these, Dr. Deffeyes, predicted that the peak did occur a couple of months ago, and he says he is no longer a prognosticator, he is now a historian, because the peak, he believes, is behind us.

"Once peak oil occurs, then the historic patterns of world oil demand and price cycles will cease. Unfortunately, Saudi Arabia has not been able to increase supply above its monthly production peak of April 2003."

And I am reminded here of a recent book by Matt Simmons called *Twilight in the Desert*. He has done a very scholarly and exhaustive study of all of the open literature and believes that Saudi Arabia has peaked in oil production.

□ 2215

Iraq may also have significant excess capacity if it can be brought into production. Under Saddam Hussein, we got about 2½ million barrels a day from Iraq; now we are lucky to get 1½ million barrels a day.

Meanwhile, domestic oil production in both the lower 48 States and Alaska continues to decline. Many non-OPEC oil producers have also passed or are currently reaching their peaks of production. Indeed, Madam Speaker, of the 48 largest oil-producing countries in the world, 33 have already peaked.

And now their recommendations. And excuse me for reading, but to paraphrase this would not have quite the impact of reading exactly their words. The coming years will see significant increases in energy costs across the spectrum. Not only are energy costs an issue, but also reliability, availability, and security.

It is time to think strategically about energy and how the Army, and please substitute here the United States, should respond to the global and national energy picture. A path of enlightened self-interest is encouraged. The 21st century is not the 20th century.

Issues will play out differently and geopolitics will impact the energy posture of the Nation. Technology will change more rapidly and flexibility will be a crucial part of installation operations. This must also extend to the energy infrastructure and its operational concepts.

And then this very interesting statement: the days of inexpensive, convenient, abundant energy sources are quickly drawing to a close. When I read that, Madam Speaker, I was reminded of the short paragraph that Matt Savinar uses in introducing his discussion of peak oil.

He says: "Dear reader. Civilization as we know it is coming to an end soon." I hope that he is overly pessimistic. We will see. Domestic natural gas production peaked in 1973. Now, note this statistic, Madam Speaker: the proved domestic reserve lifetime for natural gas at current consumption rates is about 8.4 years.

What this says is, if we can get all of our gas from our resources, it would

last 8.4 years. Of course, we cannot get it out that fast. So we are importing gas. But that is all we have remaining is 8.4 years. This is the Corps of Engineers.

The proved world reserve lifetime for natural gas is about 40 years, but will follow a traditional rise to a peak, then a rapid decline. Domestic oil production peaked in 1970 and continues to decline. This is a really startling statistic. Proved domestic reserve lifetime for oil is about 3.4 years.

That means if we could pump oil as fast as we are using it, our 2 percent of the world's reserve would last us, at the rate at which we are using oil, 3.4 years.

World oil production is at or near its peak; and current world demand exceeds the supply, which is why oil is about \$75 a barrel. Saudi Arabia is considered to be the bellwether nation for oil production and has not increased production since April of 2003. After peak production, supply no longer meets demand; prices and competition increase.

World proved reserves lifetime for oil is about 41 years, most of this at a declining availability. Our current throw-away nuclear cycle uses up the world reserve of low-cost uranium in about 20 years. We will see significant depletion of Earth's finite fossil resources in this century. We must act now to develop the technology and infrastructure necessary to transition to other sources.

This is dated September of last year, Madam Speaker. Have you seen anybody in authority in our country telling the American people this? We must act now to develop the technology and infrastructure necessary to transition to other energy sources.

Policy changes leap ahead of technology breakthroughs, cultural changes and significant investment is requisite for this new energy future. Time is essential to enact these changes. The process should begin now.

Indeed, if they had written this 20 years ago, they would use exactly that same language. Because we really should have started some 20 years ago.

Madam Speaker, what is all of this about? What are they talking about? To understand that, we need to go back about six decades and to the life of a very, now very famous oil geologist, Dr. M. King Hubbert, who worked for the Shell Oil Company.

In 1956, as a result of his studies, he published a paper that the 50th-year anniversary of that was March 8, in which he predicted that the United States would peak in oil production about 1970.

Now this was revolutionary. Because at that time I believe we were the largest producer of oil in the world, and probably the largest exporter of oil in the world. Shell Oil Company pleaded with him not to publish a paper, that we would make him and them look really silly.

He published the paper anyhow. And 14 years later when right on target we

peaked, he became kind of a celebrity. What we have here, Madam Speaker, is his predicted curve, the smooth green curve. And then the more ragged curve, green curve with the largest symbols represents the actual data points.

And you see that right on schedule in 1970, oil production peaked. Now, this is the lower 48. He did not know about Alaska at that time, and in just a moment we will look at another chart which includes Alaska.

The red there, by the way, is the Soviet Union. More oil than we, peaked just a bit after us. They kind of fell apart when the Soviet Union fell apart, and they are now having a second small peak. But after that it will be continually downhill.

The next chart shows where we have been getting our oil from. Not just in the lower 48. And that is this blue curve and the dark blue one under it, Texas and the rest of the United States. But then you see the natural gas liquids and the Alaska oil, and the Gulf of Mexico oil.

And you see that in 1970 we peaked, and just a little blip in the downhill side of what is called Hubbert's peak here. I remember particularly, Madam Speaker, the fabled Gulf of Mexico oil discoveries which were supposed to get us home free. That is the yellow on this chart. Notice the relatively trifling contribution that the Gulf of Mexico oil discoveries made, about 4,000 wells out there. We were reminded of that last fall with these hurricanes, when a number of them were damaged.

The next chart is from the Hirsch report, and that shows you what we do with this oil. It is really kind of interesting. The light blue here represents transportation. That is about 70 percent of all of the energy from the oil that we use is used in transportation. Then there is industrial and a little bit of electric power and a little bit commercially. But the major part of our oil is used in transportation.

That is a liquid fuel. And, you know, the challenge is to find something to replace that. The next chart is a really interesting one, and we could spend a long time on this chart, because it has so much information on it.

But I want to look at it just in gross form here. The bar graphs here represent the discovery of oil, and you see that way back in 1940 we were discovering some big fields of oil. And then a little later in the 1950s, the 1960s, the 1970s, we were discovering a lot of oil.

And our use of oil was very small then. The heavy black line here represents our use of oil, and notice that we were finding enormously more oil than we were using.

So there was every reason to believe that for the foreseeable future and beyond everything was going to be just fine, because we were finding enormous amounts of oil and we were not using very much oil. But then that all turned around about 1980.

Because at about that time, the discoveries of oil reached a maximum, and

then they trailed off. And you can see it here on the downslope here. And in spite of improved techniques, in spite of intense drilling, year by year, we have found on the average less and less oil.

For those who are familiar with curves like this, it is quite obvious that the area under this curve, if we were to draw a smooth line through this discovery curve, the area under that curve represents the total volume of oil which has been discovered.

And the area under the consumption curve represents the total amount of oil that we have consumed. Now, it is very obvious that you cannot consume oil that you have not discovered, and so to find out how much consumption we can have in the future, all one needs to do is to look at the area under this discovery curve, and then to project where you think the consumption curve is going.

Now, this chart has peaking occurring, what, in 5 years or so, about 2010. There are a number of people who believe that peaking has occurred about now or will occur very shortly.

The lightly shaded part of this graph, of course, is to the future; and, Madam Speaker, you can make that future within limits look about any way you want to make it look. For instance, if we use enhanced oil recovery, and we drill a lot more wells, the United States has drilled 530,000 wells. I believe there are about 400 wells in Saudi Arabia and maybe 300 in Iraq, both of which have enormously more reserves than we have.

But if you vigorously go after this oil, you might get it sooner. But if you get it sooner, there will be less later, unless you are really good at enhanced oil recovery and you are able to get significantly more out of the ground. The next chart kind of puts this in long-range perspective, and this is a really interesting chart.

Looking at the top chart here, we are looking back about 400 years through history; and we see that the quadrillion Btus, it is so near the zero line here that you probably cannot see the difference. And then we began the Industrial Revolution in the late 1700s. And we began that with wood, of course. We denuded the hills of New England, the mountains of New England, carrying charcoal to England to make steel. We have a little furnace up here in Frederick County, and we denuded the hills of northern Frederick County to provide charcoal for that little furnace there.

The Industrial Revolution was stuttering with wood when we found coal and were able to utilize that. And then look what happened, Madam Speaker, when we discovered gas and oil. It just took off. This is an exponential curve at about a 2 percent growth rate.

In a moment we will show this same curve with different units on the ordinate abscissa, and it will appear to be a much less dramatic curve there because it really spread out the abscissa here.

But I would like to note that the world population has reasonably followed this energy cycle. So that we went from about one-half a billion to about 1 billion people here. Steady state for quite a long time until we now have between 6 and 7 billion people.

And that dramatic increase in the world's population was largely due to the incredible quantity and quality of energy from oil and natural gas. I would like to reflect for just a moment on the quality of this energy, the energy density of these fossil fuels.

One barrel of oil, and you will now pay a bit more than \$100 for the refined product at the pump, 42 gallons, will buy you the work output of 12 people working all year for you.

If you worked really hard in your yard this weekend for a full day, I will get more work, more mechanical work out of an electric motor for less than 25 cents' worth of electricity. And that may be kind of humbling to recognize that we are worth less than 25 cents a day in terms of the energy available in these fossil fuels.

Madam Speaker, our children and certainly our grandchildren will look back at our generation and the generation of our parents, and I say that because my father lived almost half way through the age of oil, and they will wonder how we could have behaved the way we have behaved.

□ 2230

When we found this incredible resource, this wealth, we should have stopped and asked ourselves, what do we need to do so we can provide the most good for the most people for the longest time with this incredible wealth. It should have been obvious to everybody that this was not infinite. The earth is not made of oil. It is a finite resource.

We are now, as this chart shows in 5,000 years of recorded history, about 100, 150 years into the age of oil. In another 100, 150 years, we will be through the age of oil. What, then, when we have had to transition to the renewables?

Notice here, Madam Speaker, what happened in the 1970s. That was really quite dramatic. There was a worldwide recession, demand for oil fell, the price collapsed, and we reduced our energy consumption. It is now with China and India and the developing world demanding more and more oil increasing again at the same kind of a rate that it did up till 1970.

Madam Speaker, I would like to give one statistic that is just startling. Up until the Carter years, in every decade we used as much oil as had been used in all of previous history. What that means is, had we continued on that course, and fortunately we did not as this chart shows, but had we continued on that course when we had used up half of the world's supply of oil, only one decade of oil would have remained. In 5,000 years of recorded history, the

age of oil would be just a blip, about 300 years long is all, out of 5,000 years of recorded history.

The next chart shows the predictions of some of the experts about when peaking should occur, and this is from the Hirsch report, and this was about a year ago, and they could not have known that Dr. Deffeyes was going to conclude that the peaking has already occurred. He gave a specific date for that, and he rather humorously said he is no longer a prognosticator, he is a historian.

Well, all these people believe the peak is going to occur in the next 5 years; and then there are a few that believe it will occur about 5 years after that. Then there are Serum, Shell Oil Company, a few who believe it will be sometime in the future. Nobody, Madam Speaker, will contend that we will not have peaking. It is not if. It is when.

The next chart is a simple depiction. It shows the same curve, that really dramatic one you saw a couple of charts ago, when we had this dramatic increase in the production of energy, same curve. You can make it short and very high or spread out, depending upon the units you use in the ordinate and the abscissa.

This is a 2 percent exponential growth rate, and notice that starts out rather slow, but 2 percent, leave the interest in the bank, it grows and grows till it is now getting quite steep, even on this expanded abscissa scale.

As you saw from the previous chart, most of the experts believe that oil peaking is either now or very shortly in the future. If, as we have indicated here, we are at this point, then the peaking will indeed occur a couple of years or so hence.

But notice that the discrepancy between the oil we would like to use, the demand curve and the oil which is available to use, begins before the curve. It will not be as smooth as this. It will be ups and downs, and oil may again fall down to \$50 a barrel. That will be nice. Do not count on it.

What we have produced here is what is called a gap. That is a difference between what is available to use and what we would like to use; and, as the next chart shows, the Hirsch Report focused on the problems of filling that gap. What they did is look at the consequences of filling the gap, dependent upon when you start to fill the gap, and if you wait until peaking has occurred, you see zero here, that is when it has occurred. Then there will be significant shortfall. You will be able to do some mitigation.

In a few minutes, we will talk more about that mitigation; and I wonder if, in fact, we should try to mitigate or whether we need to effect a steady state where we can live happily and productively at the current energy level and thus leave a little more for our kids and our grandkids and a little more for the next few years just ahead of us.

What it shows here is that if you are going to have no supply shortfall, that you need to begin the mitigation 20 years before peaking occurs. Now, from all of the experts' predictions that we saw, that is going to be manifestly impossible because almost nobody believes that peaking is two decades from now. So what one would conclude from this is that there are going to be consequences.

The next chart shows what we would be using to peak. We would be using enhanced oil recovery, coal liquids; and, by the way, South Africa and Hitler's Germany demonstrated you can indeed do that; heavy oil, that is the oil shales, tar sands and so forth, gas-to-liquids and then vehicle efficiency.

I mentioned previously how long these vehicles stay in the fleet. If you start here, there will be several years before you notice any effect, and then slowly over 50 years. That is a little less than the average lifetime of the average car and pickup in the fleet and about half the average lifetime of an 18-wheeler in the fleet.

Madam Speaker, I would like to wonder if, in fact, we ought to be trying to fill the peak, that is, to fill this gap till there is no shortfalls so that the world can continue to use all the oil that it would like to use. Notice that, except for vehicle efficiency, we are dealing here with finite resources. They are not forever, and the more we use now, the less we will have to use in the future.

Today, we are amassing the largest intergenerational debt transfer in the history of the world. I would like not to include with that an enormous energy deficit that we are going to pass on to our kids and our grandkids. We are already burdening them with an enormous responsibility to not only run their government on current revenue but to pay back all of the money that we borrowed from their generations to run our government today. In good conscience, Madam Speaker, can we also borrow from their generations the fossil fuel energies which will be essential for establishing any reasonable quality of life in their generations?

I would submit that the challenge should not be to fill the gap. The challenge should rather be to establish an infrastructure and economy, lifestyles that can be interesting and productive and sustaining while we make the inevitable transition to renewables. These are all finite. You cannot fill that gap forever with these. As a matter of fact, for some of them, you cannot fill it very long.

The next chart shows us something about the consequences of excessive consumption. This is a really interesting chart. I would like to start here with this little insert where I think we are, and this is from our Energy Information Agency, and they get the data from the USGS. We talked to the Energy Information Agency, and they just use the information from USGS,

and I think this is a rather meaningful misrepresentation of what the world will look like.

Madam Speaker, for any statisticians out there, it will be quite obvious that the 50 percent probability is not the mean. The most rightly thing to happen is the 95 percent probability. That is a high probability. It is the lesser, the lower amount of oil.

By the way, the 50 percent probability means that there could be a whole lot more oil. It also means there could be a whole lot less oil. You just do not know. What the Energy Information Agency does and the USGS is to assume that 50 percent probability is the mean. This is an unusual, and one might say bizarre, use of statistics, but using these statistics, you end up with almost twice the recoverable oil left in the world.

You see, they said that the ultimate recovery would be about 2 trillion barrels of oil with a 95 percent probability. We have already used about half of that, about 1 trillion barrels. So there is about 1 trillion left.

With the mean, which they say is expected, now that is not the expected value. The expected value is the 95 percent probability. That is the most probable. That is what it means. It is the most probable.

But with this assumption that that is the mean, which is a bizarre use of statistics, that pushes the peak out only from here at about 2000 to about 2016. So even if there is that much more oil there, and, by the way, only half of that yet to be pumped 2 trillion barrels have been found, you remember that earlier chart that showed the steep decline in discoveries, one must project something phenomenal in the future, that it will look just vastly different than the last few years. It would discover enormous basins of oil, and there is no expert out there that I know who believes that anything like that is going to happen. Notice that you push the peak out only about 10 years if you have that much more oil.

Now there is another interesting assumption that is made here, and that is if you can produce it with enhanced oil recovery and then you have a 10 percent decline, look what happens. You are really falling off a cliff.

The next chart kind of puts this in perspective; and it is these numbers, Madam Speaker, which prompted Boyden Gray and Frank Gafney and Jim Woolsey and 27 other prominent Americans, four-star admirals and generals, to write to the President some months ago, a number of months ago, saying, Madam Speaker, the fact that we have only 2 percent of the world oil reserves and we use 25 percent of the world's oil, importing almost two-thirds of what we use, is an unacceptable national security risk. Mr. President, we have got to do something about that.

Even if you think that the only problem with oil is a national security risk, we ought to be about freeing ourselves

from the dependence on foreign oil. Even if there was no such thing as peaking, our behavior today needs to be vastly different than it is.

We are less than 5 percent of the world's population, about one person out of 22, and we use a fourth of the world's energy.

Madam Speaker, when we found all of that oil, and we more than others fit this characterization, rather than a responsible response to that discovery, which would ask the question how can we get the most good for the most people for the longest time, we acted like kids that found the cookie jar. We just pigged out, and here in the United States we are now using 25 percent of all the world's oil, and we represent a bit less than 5 percent of the world's population.

These top two numbers are significant. With only 2 percent of the oil reserves, we are pumping 8 percent of the world's oil. That means we are pumping our wells four times faster than the average in the world, which means that we are going to be increasingly dependent on foreign oil as we pump down our reserves.

The next chart kind of puts this in a global perspective. Because what this shows, and many people now recognize this, that for the last several years China has been scouring the world for oil. We have symbols here which show who has access to the major sources of oil in the world, and notice the symbol for China is all over this map. They have bought all of the increased capacity of the Canadian oil sands. They have major commitments from South American countries. They almost bought Unocal in our country. They have really major commitments from the Middle East.

Madam Speaker, not only this, but they recognize that we have the only blue water Navy, that is the Navy that sails the seven seas of the world and can control all of the access lanes. They see that we could, if we wish, cut off their source of oil.

□ 2245

So they are very aggressively building a blue water Navy.

Last year, we launched one submarine; they launched 14 submarines. Now theirs are not the quality of ours, certainly, but they are improving.

Well, what do we do? And the next chart kind of presents this challenge and this picture. Obviously, if what these two big reports say is true, that we are just about reached peaking, then we need to be about transitioning. In fact, we should have been about transitioning from fossil fuels to the renewables.

Madam Speaker, we knew of a certainty 26 years ago in 1980 we had already slid 10 years down the other side of Hubbard's Peak. Now, M.P. Hubbard was right about the United States. He predicted that the world would be peaking about now. Madam Speaker, he was right about the United States.

Would you not think that our leaders have wondered maybe, just maybe, he might be right about the world, and maybe we ought to be doing something about that? There has been a deafening silence on this subject for the last 26 years.

Any rational person, get a bright fifth grader and he will tell you what we need to be doing: We need to call upon all of our finite resources to help us through this transition period, and those finite resources are the tars and the oil shales and coal. And then there is nuclear as kind of a separate class, light water reactors, breeder reactors.

And note the quote from the Corps of Engineers study that the high-quality cheap, that is fissionable, uranium, will be exhausted in about 20 years, so we will need to move to breeder reactors which, as the name implies, makes more fuel than they use and so they are kind of self-sustaining. But, with that, you buy some problems of transportation and enriching and products that could be used by bad guys for making nuclear weapons.

I have a number of colleagues who have been stoutly opposed to nuclear, but when they are now rationally considering the alternative of shivering in the dark, nuclear is looking better and better.

Nuclear fusion, if we ever got there, Madam Speaker, we are home free. There is nothing else on this chart that gets us home free. Fusion does. I support happily the roughly \$250 million a year that we put into this technology. But I think that counting on solving our energy future challenges with fusion is a bit like me or you, Madam Speaker, planning to solve our personal economic problems by winning the lottery, and I think the odds are probably somewhere near the same.

Once we have gone through these finite resources and have developed all the nuclear that we wish to develop, then we will ultimately, and the geology will assure it, because coal, gas and oil are not forever, we will transition to the renewables, and these are what they are, solar and wind and geothermal. That is true geothermal, where you are tapping into the molten core of the earth. There is not a chimney in all of Iceland because all of their energy is geothermal there, ocean energy, the tides and thermal gradients and so forth.

Agriculture resources, a lot of talk today about ethanol and methanol and soy diesel and biodiesel and biomass. Waste energy, a great idea. Instead of putting it in a landfill, burn it. There is lots of energy there. A very productive plant, state-of-the-art plant up in Montgomery County who would be happy, Madam Speaker, to have you come visit them there.

And then hydrogen from renewables. That is significant. Today, we are getting all of our hydrogen from natural gas. That is not renewable. That, by and by, will be gone, and then we will have to get hydrogen from renewables or from nuclear.

Just a word of caution. Hydrogen is not an energy source. We will always use more energy to produce hydrogen than we get out of it, or else we will have to suspend the second law of thermodynamics. And, Mr. Speaker, if we can do that, we can suspend the law of gravity and we are really home free, are we not?

Why even talk about hydrogen then? Well, because of the two characteristics of hydrogen. One is when you finally burn it, you get water that is not polluted. And if you have used a non-polluting energy source to produce it like nuclear, for instance, or wind or solar, then you are totally nonpolluting.

The second advantage of hydrogen is that it is quite ideal for fuel cells if in fact we are ever able to make fuel cells that are economic. With the fuel cell, you get about twice the efficiency or at least twice the efficiency that you get out of reciprocating engine.

The next chart looks at coal. And some will tell you do not worry about energy because we have got an incredible supply of coal, they will tell you, in 500 years. That is not true. At current use rates, we do have 250 years of energy, of coal.

Albert Einstein said that compound interest was the most powerful force in the universe. If you increase its use only 2 percent, that 250 years shrinks to about 85 years. And, now, if you have to use some of the energy from the coal to convert to a gas or a liquid, and we will have to do that because we have limited uses for coal itself, then you reduce it to 50 years. That is meaningful. But it is a finite resource. It is not forever. It is dirty. You are either going to pay a big environmental penalty or an economic penalty for cleaning it up.

The next chart is an interesting one, and that looks at the opportunities and limitations from the agricultural world. On the top here, we have two little sequences which indicate the energy transformation from petroleum, and notice that you start out with maybe 5 equivalents of energy and end up with 4, so it is 5:4. And with corn to ethanol, you ought to do better, because you are getting some energy from the sun here. There are lots of challenges. It is or it can be energy positive. It certainly is in South America, where Brazil is converting sugar cane, which is a bit better than corn, to ethanol, and they are now freeing themselves from dependence on imported oil and soon all of their cars will be ethanol cars.

The bottom pie chart here is something I wanted to spend just a moment on because it is so startling. This shows you the energy input into producing a bushel of corn. Notice the purple area there, almost half of it, it says nitrogen, that is nitrogen fertilizer made from natural gas. When natural gas is gone, that source of nitrogen fertilizer is gone.

Madam Speaker, before we learned how to do that, the only source of ni-

trogen fertilizer was barnyard manure and guano. The guano is gone. It took tens of thousands of years to produce it, we believe, and now it is harvested, and it is gone. That is the droppings from birds and bats on tropical islands and caves and so forth.

All those other segments of the pie here are other fossil fuel energy inputs into growing corn. I would just like to emphasize in very large measure the food we eat is just transformed gas and oil, and without gas and oil it would be very difficult to produce the amounts of food that we are producing today.

The next chart is a really interesting one. The little analogy that I use here is that we are very much like a young couple whose grandparents have died and left them a big inheritance, and they have established a lifestyle where 85 percent of all the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance and only 15 percent from their income. They look at the inheritance and how old they are and project a reasonable life span, and, gee, the grandparents' inheritance is going to give out long before we retire. So, obviously, Madam Speaker, they have got to do one or both of two things: Either they have got to make more money, or they have got to spend less money.

I use that 85/15, and others will use 86/14. The 85/15 shows what our energy dependence is now. About 85 percent of all the energy we use comes from fossil fuels. That is like the inheritance from our grandparents: It will not last forever. And only about 15 percent of it comes from other sources. A bit more than half of it that comes from nuclear power, 8 percent of our total energy, 20 percent of our electricity.

As you drive home tonight, note that every fifth business and every fifth house would be dark if it weren't for nuclear power.

Then we look at that 7 percent which is renewable energy, and the biggest chunk of that is conventional hydro that will not grow in our country. We may get some micro-hydro, but the big rivers have all been dammed and probably more than we should have dammed.

The next biggest chunk of that comes from wood, and that is the paper industry and the timber industry wisely burning a waste product that would otherwise end up in the landfill.

And then waste energy, that 8 percent. By the way, this 1 percent is 0.07 percent, because that is 1 percent of 7 percent from solar. That is a tiny, tiny amount of energy. But this was in 2000. That has been growing at 30 percent a year, so now it is about four times bigger. It is now 0.28 percent. Big deal, Madam Speaker. 0.28 percent? And that is about the same thing for wind, maybe a bit more from agriculture.

Those are the energy sources we are going to have to increasingly rely on in the future. So we have got a big challenge ahead of us.

The next chart depicts what we ought to be doing. The first thing we

need to do is to buy some time. You see, it takes three things to develop these renewables: It takes money, and it takes energy, and it takes time. Mr. Speaker, we will not worry about the money, although we should. Because when it comes to money we just borrow it from our kids and our grandkids by running up a big debt. So let us not worry about the money here.

But we cannot borrow time from our kids, and we cannot borrow energy from our kids. The only way to buy some time and free up some energy is with a pretty massive conservation program which frees up some energy.

Today, Madam Speaker, there is no surplus energy to invest in alternatives. All of it is needed by the economies of the world, or oil would not be roughly \$75 a barrel.

Madam Speaker, what this chart denotes is a program that I think needs three qualities if we are going to make this transition in any acceptable way. First, we must have everybody involved, a total commitment like World War II. I lived through that. Everybody had a victory garden, everybody saved their household grease and took it to a central repository. It was the last war, the last time that everybody in our country was involved. We need a program, Madam Speaker, that has the total commitment of our population in World War II. It needs to have the technology focus of putting a man on the moon, because we are going to have to have a lot of technology breakthroughs and applications here if we are going to make it.

Thirdly, it needs to have the intensity of the Manhattan Project. Minus that, I think we are going to have a very rough ride. We should have begun 26 years ago.

Once we have freed up some time and freed up some energy, we need to use it wisely. And what has the biggest potential? What will have the biggest payoff? I think there are enormous benefits to this. I can see the American people going to bed every night thinking to themselves, gee, I really contributed today. I used less energy, I lived very comfortably, and I am really working on that new project which is going to help my kids and my grandkids to live as well as I live or maybe even better.

I think that we can be a role model for the world. I think that we can develop a lot of technology that we can export, but, Mr. Speaker, we will never get there unless we start.

I am wondering again, unless we close in the way we started, these two big studies paid for by our government noting the problems that we face in the future, why have not those parts of the government that paid for these reports claimed ownership? Why are they not using the resources available to them to make this information available to the American people? Why are they not coming to us with a program that says we have a big challenge, we have big opportunities, we really need to get going?

Madam Speaker, I think that we have a great bright future if we challenge the American people and marshal the resource. I think we have a very bumpy ride if we do not.

I look forward, Madam Speaker, to our leadership showing the way. I think Americans will follow. I think that we can be a role model to the world, and I think that we can get through this with less problems than many are depicting, but we won't get there unless we start.

□ 2300

COVER THE UNINSURED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight during Cover the Uninsured Week to draw attention to a national crisis. According to the Census Bureau, 45.8 million Americans are without health insurance. Millions more encounter a health care system that is inadequate in meeting their basic medical needs because they are underinsured.

The Commonwealth Fund recently released a study estimating that there are an additional 16 million Americans who are underinsured, meaning their insurance does not adequately protect them against catastrophic health care expenses. That means that 61 million Americans either have no health insurance or have only sporadic coverage or have insurance coverage that leaves them exposed to very high health costs. Sixty-one million Americans is nearly 20 percent of all Americans. That is one in five Americans who have inadequate or no health care coverage at all.

The lack of affordable, comprehensive health care affects every congressional district in this Nation. To highlight the issue and the real impact that being uninsured has on the lives of Americans, I have selected some letters that I have received from my constituents who have had difficulty obtaining and affording comprehensive health care coverage.

Too often here in Congress we speak of health care issues in the antiseptic jargon of policymakers and lawyers, but people across America are hurting and these letters tell their stories in their own words.

I represent a district in south central Wisconsin, and while the letters I read may be from Wisconsinites, they speak to the difficulties people all over the United States face every day. I am going to start with a few letters about the ever-increasing price of health care.

Eva from Madison, Wisconsin writes, "I am contacting you in regards to my desperate need for public health care. I am a grad student. I recently sprained

my ankle playing soccer and had to go to the emergency room for x-rays. My bill came out to \$1,242.50 because I can only afford a measly insurance that only has catastrophic coverage. This is a ridiculous amount of money for such a visit, and it causes me to consider those less fortunate than me who have even more serious injuries and less familial support. This cost can truly make waves in the lives of people."

Suzanne from Stoughton, Wisconsin writes, "It is time, time to have the government deal with health care. We are covered under COBRA which will run out in March. The cost is going from \$500 per month to \$900 per month. We checked with Blue Cross and they refuse us coverage because of a pre-existing condition. They will not even offer a waiver for this preexisting condition. We checked with the Wisconsin State insurance program which will cover us for \$1,200 a month. Please, let people over 60 buy into Medicare. It is impossible to find a job that offers health insurance."

Roberta from Janesville, Wisconsin writes, "I think the insurance bills for both medical and dental are horrendous. Both my husband and I work full time with two small children, living paycheck to paycheck. My insurance costs have caused us many heartaches with us owing more money than what needs to be paid. As a result, I will not get a needed medical procedure done. Something drastically needs to change in the United States of America where hardworking individuals and families can get the treatment they need without going broke."

Roberta brings up an important point in her letter because people without health insurance are often not getting the care that they need. A recent study released by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that cost prevented 41.1 percent of uninsured adults from seeing a doctor that they needed to see.

But getting needed care is also difficult for Americans who have health insurance because the financial strain resulting from high health care costs, rising premiums, and increasing copays and deductibles place an incredible strain on American families, often forcing them to choose between needed health care and basic necessities like food. It is no wonder that illness, injury, and medical debt is responsible for nearly 50 percent of all personal bankruptcies in the United States.

Patricia from Madison, Wisconsin writes, "We need to fix health care. I have to choose between heat and food and medications. I have lost 80 pounds because of this. Please help."

Heather from Waterloo, Wisconsin writes, "I am married, and together with my husband I own a home. We live a modest, middle-class life, managing to always have what we need except for health care coverage. My husband has excellent health care at his job, but for me to also be covered by his plan, we would need to pay nearly \$400 a month. That is two-thirds as much as our

home mortgage. Through school, I have worked less and less in order to maintain health coverage. I have only been able to afford short-term major medical coverage. I am grateful that we can afford this, but it does make a difference. Even now if I have a sore throat, I will wait for a few days to see how I feel. I will wait because if I don't need to go, I will certainly save the money. This is disturbing to me as a nursing student because I know about the importance of early treatment and prevention, and it is upsetting to me as a person because I value my health. It is unacceptable to me as a citizen because I know there are other people just like me who wait and get sicker or can't take the medications they need."

Mr. Speaker, simply put, our health care system is failing and America knows this. Among the thousands of letters regarding health care that I receive, there is a common thread, a common theme that binds them together; and that common theme is an overwhelming frustration with a system they know just is not working and a call for us in Congress to take action.

Brad from Mount Horeb, Wisconsin writes, "I write you today to urge you to take action on a growing crisis in America: health care. I strongly believe that we need a national health care plan to insure all Americans. My major concern with the current system is that when people attempt to obtain insurance, insurance companies refuse them because of past health history. Let's face it, insurance companies are in business to make a profit. The best way to make a profit is to insure the healthy so that you can minimize the claims you pay out and not insure those who need medical care or who may potentially need medical care."

I am 38 years old with a family of four. I currently participate in a health savings account. For all practical purposes, I pay for all of my own medical needs, including the recent birth of our daughter. I recently attempted to switch insurance providers. The insurance companies will insure me, but they will not insure my daughter for any type of treatment for her asthma for 3 years along with no drug coverage for life. The policy I was requesting had a \$10,000 deductible, yet they still refused the coverage."

Kimberly from Madison, Wisconsin writes, "I am writing today because of my family's frustration and anxiety over health care. Although we hear a lot of rhetoric about making health care more affordable and/or more available for Americans, nothing is happening, at least not soon enough."

□ 2310

"Let me briefly share our story," Kimberly proceeds. "My husband recently started his own business. Obviously, it will take some time for his new company to see any profits, much less income. In the meantime, we are without health insurance. I am 5 months pregnant, and we have a 2-

year-old son. Because of my pre-existing condition, we cannot buy affordable health coverage. COBRA would cost us \$1,200 per month. I am currently applying for Medicaid and other forms of public assistance as a last resort. This is ridiculous."

"As someone with no insurance, I wonder what could possibly be the problem with implementing a public health care system. Oh, I have heard the horror stories about having fewer choices in doctors, longer waiting lists for procedures, and less incentive among doctors and researchers to develop new techniques. But what's most frightening to me is the chance that my son might get sick or my baby might be born with expensive complications while we are uninsured."

"I am not naive. I know that funding public health care is an issue. But is it wise to sacrifice the health and well-being of American citizens to avoid the challenge of implementing a change? I, for one, would be satisfied to pay more for goods and services if I could rest assured that my family's basic health care needs were being met."

Victor, from Stoughton, Wisconsin writes, "My wife can only work part time because of her health. Her employer offers a generic policy that costs only \$3.97 per week and requires no background check. This policy covers basically nothing. Medical supplies, checkups, doctors visits necessary on a routine basis for my wife to survive are now not covered. My wife is uninsurable because of her health, and we have been turned down for health insurance that we have applied for. We cannot believe that this is happening."

Ronald from Deerfield, Wisconsin writes, "I was on COBRA insurance for 3 years, which ended this past fall. I spent from March until September trying to get private insurance, but could not because of my neck injury. I was, in effect, looked at and dismissed by 33 private insurance companies because of my pre-existing condition with my neck injury. Just imagine how you would feel after being dismissed by this many companies. I was finally insured through disability and Medicare. The sad reality of it is that if I want to try to work full time again, I cannot, because in doing so it would cost me the only insurance options I have left."

"The truth is that many other countries can and do provide equitable health insurance to all of their citizens, no matter what pre-existing condition they have or their ability to pay or what income level they have. I believe this country does have top-notch medical facilities, but not decent or equitable insurance for the poor and middle-income families."

Susan from Bariboo, Wisconsin writes, "I am writing you today regarding health insurance coverage for single people with no children. As of this time, I feel that I am left out of the loop in regards to this topic. I am 42, and last September I was diagnosed with breast cancer. In January of this

year, the company that I worked for informed us that they would be closing down. I was laid off in December while I was out due to my cancer treatment. I have been searching for health care everywhere because my COBRA will be going up and I am on unemployment and barely able to pay the \$244.76 for the coverage now. I cannot get insurance because of the breast cancer. HIRSP, which is the Wisconsin State High Risk Program, is too expensive for me to get coverage since they want 4 months of premiums up front, and as they only cover some things."

"What are single people supposed to do? We don't qualify for any government assistance because we are single. We cannot go without insurance. There are no programs to help us out. So when you are working on health care in the House of Representatives, please remember that there are other single people out there also in my shoes. I am at a crossroad because I have no avenue for assistance when it comes to health care. Come November, I will be unable to get coverage when I need it at this point in my life."

Janet from Portage, Wisconsin writes, "I have a 53-year-old brother who has psoriasis all over his body and arthritis that is caused by this. Three weeks ago, he fell and needs surgery on his shoulder to repair it. He has no job, no money and no insurance. We started looking for a program to help him. There are none that we can find. There is nothing to help him get his shoulder fixed. But after it heals wrong and he is disabled because of it, then there are programs to help him. They won't help him get it fixed so he could find a good job. Instead, they would rather support him for the rest of his life instead of trying to help him now."

Gail from Janesville, Wisconsin writes, "My husband lost his job in October of 2003. He applied for over 100 positions, only to be told that he lacked a college degree or he is overqualified, or they can only pay \$8 an hour. I was diagnosed with breast cancer in June of 1998 and again in 2003. I have gone through breast cancer twice and have undergone a mastectomy and reconstructive surgery."

"COBRA has run out and without a stable income, we cannot afford to pay the premiums of our own health care policy. My husband is 59 and I am 58, and we have no medical coverage. I have looked in every insurance company and get turned down because of my medical history. All our lives we have paid into these insurance companies only to be turned away when we need coverage the most."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that as Cover the Uninsured Week continues, my colleagues will join me in recognizing that obtaining comprehensive, affordable health care presents a very real challenge for millions and millions of Americans. We cannot turn a deaf ear on our constituents' pleas for help. I invite my colleagues to join me in

working on this most pressing domestic priority, to provide quality affordable health care for all Americans.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. OSBORNE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of business in the district.

Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COSTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and May 3.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, May 3.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, May 9.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, May 3 and 4.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 3 and 4.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, May 3.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WESTMORELAND, for 5 minutes, May 3.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, May 3, 4 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 18 minutes

p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7139. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modified Cry3A Protein and the Genetic Material for Its Production in Corn; Extension of a Temporary Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0174; FRL-7766-6] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7140. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyfluthrin; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0205; FRL-7766-2] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7141. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0168; FRL-7768-3] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7142. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Inert Ingredients; Revocation of 29 Pesticide Tolerance Exemptions for 27 Chemicals [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0251; FRL-7760-6] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7143. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0053; FRL-7766-8] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7144. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, Case Number 05-06, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

7145. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Austria pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7146. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia; Approval of Revisions to the State Implementation Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-GA-0005-200601; FRL-8045-4] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7147. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arkansas Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [FRL-8022-1] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7148. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; Architectural and Industrial Maintenance (AIM) Coatings Regulation [EPA-R01-OAR-2005-ME-0003; A-1-FRL-8038-1] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7149. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Texas; Permits by Rule [R06-OAR-2005-TX-0016; FRL-8045-5] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7150. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plan Revision for Colorado; Long-Term Strategy of State Implementation Plan for Class I Visibility Protection; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule [EPA-R08-OAR-2005-CO-0002; FRL-8044-4] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7151. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Testing of Certain High Production Volume Chemicals [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2005-0033; FRL-7335-2] (RIN: 2070-AD16) received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7152. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Underground Storage Tank Program: Approved State Program for Pennsylvania [FRL-8011-3] received March 14, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7153. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(I), Authority for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Perchloroethylene Air Emission Standards for Dry Cleaning Facilities: Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection [EPA-R01-OAR-2006-0277; FRL-8157-9] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7154. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Substantial Inadequacy of Implementation Plan; Call for Missouri State Implementation Plan Revision [EPA-R07-OAR-2005-MO-0007; FRL-8158-7] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7155. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revocation of TSCA Section 4 Testing Requirements for Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2003-0006; FRL-7751-7] (RIN: 2070-AD42) received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7156. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium Metasilicate; Amendment to an Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2002-0241; FRL-8063-5] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7157. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Revisions to Volatile Organic Compound Definition [EPA-R04-OAR-2005-TN-000 8-200534(a); FRL-8157-8] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7158. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Washington: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL-8158-4] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7159. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rule to Reduce Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone (Clean Air Interstate Rule): Reconsideration [OAR 2003-0053; FRL-8047-9] (RIN: 2060-AN57) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7160. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Burden Reduction Initiative [RCRA-2001-0039; FRL-8047-3] (RIN: 2050-AE50) received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7161. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Lakeview PM10 Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R10-OAR-2006-0010; FRL-8041-9] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7162. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; La Grande PM10 Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R10-OAR-2006-0050; FRL-8041-6] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7163. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of a draft bill entitled, "To implement the Antigua Convention for the Strengthening of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission"; to the Committee on International Relations.

7164. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 008-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7165. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with section 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313, a report prepared by the Department of State and the National Security Council on the progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period December 1, 2005 through January 30, 2006; to the Committee on International Relations.

7166. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Turkey (Transmittal No. DDTC 001-06); to the Committee on International Relations.

7167. A letter from the EEO Programs Director, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the second annual report pursuant to Section 203(a) of the No Fear Act, Pub. L. 107-174, for fiscal year 2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7168. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0124; FRL-8040-6] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7169. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan, Washoe County District Board of Health [EPA-R09-OAR-2005-0002, FRL-8040-8] received March 16, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7170. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended (RIN: 1400-AC06) received March 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7171. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final report entitled, "Non-military Helicopter Urban Noise Study," pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 47528(d)(2); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7172. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisan Bay, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 05-007] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7173. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Skidaway Bridge (SR 204), Intracoastal Waterway, mile 592.9, Savannah, Chatham County, GA [CGD07-04-124] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7174. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Cheesecake Creek, NJ [CGD01-05-096] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7175. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Connecticut River, East Haddam, CT [CGD01-06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 21, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7176. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Security Zones; Port Valdez, Tank vessel moving security zone and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, AK [COTP Price William Sound 02-011] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7177. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Port Valdez and Valdez Narrows, Valdez, AK [COTP Price William Sound 05-012] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7178. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Shark Rivr, NJ [CGD05-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA-09) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7179. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Elizabeth River, Eastern Branch, Virginia [CGD05-06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA-09) received January 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7180. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Oceanport Creek, Oceanport, NJ [CGD01-06-013] received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7181. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Connecticut River, Old Lyme, CT [CGD01-06-020] received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7182. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Manasquan River, Correction [CGD05-05-079] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received March 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7183. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availability of "Award of Grants and Cooperative Agreements for the Special Projects and Programs Authorized by the Agency's FY 2006 Appropriations Act" [FRL-8053-8] received April 11, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 359. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics

Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 109-448). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. S. 1736. An act to provide for the participation of employees in the judicial branch in the Federal leave transfer program for disasters and emergencies (Rept. 109-449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 789. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4954) to improve maritime and cargo security through enhanced layered defenses, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-450). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WATT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. FATAH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 9. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. BASS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HALL, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 5253. A bill to prohibit price gouging in the sale of gasoline, diesel fuel, crude oil, and home heating oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. HALL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 5254. A bill to set schedules for the consideration of permits for refineries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 5255. A bill to prohibit a school from receiving Federal funds if the school prevents a student from displaying or wearing in a respectful manner a representation of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 5256. A bill to establish a statute of repose for civil actions filed against recreational vessel manufacturers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 5257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a basic income

guarantee in the form of a refundable tax credit for taxpayers who do not itemize deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5258. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain plasma flat panel displays; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5259. A bill to require the Biomass Research and Development Board to prepare a biobased fuel action plan to increase the use in the United States of biobased fuel as a ground transportation fuel; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire (for himself and Mr. BASS):

H.R. 5260. A bill to provide that any reduction in the hours of operation of Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center emergency rooms may be implemented only after notice is provided to Congress and a period of 180 days has elapsed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5261. A bill to remove the permanent tariff and the temporary duty on ethanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. CAMP of Michigan):

H.R. 5262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the payment of premiums for high deductible health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mr. WATT, Ms. LEE, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. FATAH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 5263. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the 2006 and 2007 initial enrollment periods for the Medicare prescription drug benefit and suspend the late enrollment penalty through December 31, 2007, to permit Medicare beneficiaries to change enrollment in a prescription drug plan during the first 12 months of enrollment, and to prevent changes in formularies other than at the time of open enrollment periods and only with advance notice; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5264. A bill to provide American consumers information about the broadcast television transition from an analog to a digital

format; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HOOLEY:

H.R. 5265. A bill to provide grants to certain areas to prepare for a tsunami; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 5266. A bill to provide additional protections for farmers and ranchers that may be harmed economically by genetically engineered seeds, plants, or animals, to ensure fairness for farmers and ranchers in their dealings with biotech companies that sell genetically engineered seeds, plants, or animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 5267. A bill to prohibit the open-air cultivation of genetically engineered pharmaceutical and industrial crops, to prohibit the use of common human food or animal feed as the host plant for a genetically engineered pharmaceutical or industrial chemical, to establish a tracking system to regulate the growing, handling, transportation, and disposal of pharmaceutical and industrial crops and their byproducts to prevent human, animal, and general environmental exposure to genetically engineered pharmaceutical and industrial crops and their byproducts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 5268. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the safety of genetically engineered foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 5269. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Federal Meat Inspection Act, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require that food that contains a genetically engineered material, or that is produced with a genetically engineered material, be labeled accordingly; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 5270. A bill to ensure that efforts to address world hunger through the use of genetically engineered animals and crops actually help developing countries and peoples while protecting human health and the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 5271. A bill to assign liability for injury caused by genetically engineered organisms; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy

and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 5272. A bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the Administrator of the United States Fire Administration to provide assistance to firefighting task forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 5273. A bill to promote open broadband networks and innovation, foster electronic commerce, and safeguard consumer access to online content and services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 5274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for the provision of boating safety equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 5275. A bill to establish the Silver Scholarship program to provide transferable educational awards to older individuals who have performed certain volunteer services; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 5276. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to include a grant program to support life-long learning programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 5277. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Assistant Secretary, when making grants for multidisciplinary centers of gerontology and gerontology centers of special emphasis, to give preference with respect to such centers that are located at institutions of higher education in urban areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Con. Res. 397. Concurrent resolution honoring 2006 Olympic team member Joey Cheek and recognizing the need to work with international partners to help bring an end to the ongoing genocide in Darfur region of Sudan and the suffering of children in Chad; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr.

LANGEVIN, Mr. FARR, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GORDON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H. Res. 788. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 790. A resolution recognizing the African American Spiritual as a national treasure; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H. Res. 791. A resolution recognizing the establishment of Hunters for the Hungry programs across the United States and the contributions of those programs efforts to decrease hunger and help feed those in need; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. OWENS):

H. Res. 792. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the independence of Guyana and extending best wishes to Guyana for peace and further progress, development, and prosperity; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. TANNER):

H. Res. 793. A resolution affirming that statements of national unity, including the National Anthem, should be recited or sung in English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

302. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 118 urging the enforcement of the reduced maximum containment level for arsenic in drinking water be suspended until such time as definitive scientific evidence with the United States validates that consumption of water between 10 to 50 PPB of arsenic causes cancer mortality or produces some other health problems; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

303. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 120 opposing any proposals which lead to a significant sale of federal land located in the state of Idaho; to the Committee on Resources.

304. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 113 supporting the confirmation of the appointment of Judge N. Randy Smith to serve on the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

305. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 119 requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt S. 520 and H.R. 1070; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

306. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution No. 441 supporting the vision

of "25 by 25," whereby agriculture will provide twenty-five percent of the total energy consumed in the United States by the year 2025, while continuing to produce abundant, safe, and affordable food and fiber; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 278: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 311: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 378: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 550: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 552: Mr. SODREL.
H.R. 559: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 602: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. FOSSELLA.
H.R. 633: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 819: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BAKER, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 831: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 916: Mr. SHIMKUS and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD.
H.R. 986: Mr. FATTAH and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 998: Mr. PORTER and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1106: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1188: Ms. HOOLEY.
H.R. 1306: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 1366: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1372: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1380: Mr. BONNER and Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 1384: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1415: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1425: Mr. HONDA, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 1431: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1554: Mrs. EMERSON and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 1578: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1588: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 1632: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1872: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1932: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1951: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2048: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2070: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2071: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2076: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2178: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 2230: Mr. BASS.
H.R. 2231: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 2317: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2553: Mr. WU.
H.R. 2567: Mr. WU.
H.R. 2629: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2716: Mr. GORDON and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2793: Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. HART, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 2870: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2877: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3183: Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 3186: Mr. OSBORNE and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3189: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
H.R. 3385: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3427: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3466: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3476: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of

California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3584: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3683: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 3690: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 3762: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3852: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 3858: Mr. BONNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3883: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. GUTNECHT.

H.R. 3915: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3964: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WU, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 4025: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4059: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 4166: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4184: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 4188: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 4201: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 4222: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4232: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4236: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PENCE, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 4259: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4293: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4318: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 4341: Mr. LEACH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 4347: Mr. HONDA and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 4384: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4409: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4421: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4479: Ms. HOOLEY and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 4597: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 4608: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 4683: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 4695: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 4703: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. BEAN, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 4708: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4727: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4730: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 4736: Mr. CARNAHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4740: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 4755: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. McKEON, Ms. HARRIS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4760: Mr. CARNAHAN and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4761: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 4773: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4775: Mr. JINDAL.

H.R. 4828: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4836: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 4844: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 4871: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4894: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KELLER, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 4897: Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 4902: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 4903: Mr. HOYER and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 4953: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4960: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 4976: Mr. PAUL and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 5005: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 5013: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 5022: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5035: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 5037: Mr. KIRK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SKELTON, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 5065: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 5099: Mr. EVANS and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 5120: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 5129: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 5134: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 5135: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 5143: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5150: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 5158: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5159: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 5166: Mr. POMBO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 5170: Mr. PITTS, Mr. HALL, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5177: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 5201: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 5204: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 5206: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 5209: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 5225: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 5230: Mrs. KELLY and Ms. FOXF.

H.R. 5252: Mr. BASS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. BONO, Mr. HALL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Con. Res. 235: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Con. Res. 347: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BASS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FORD, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. LEACH.

H. Con. Res. 380: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. McCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 392: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LANTOS and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 393: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 395: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 396: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 212: Mr. BACA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 245: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Res. 327: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. DICKS.

H. Res. 675: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. FATTAH.

H. Res. 697: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 699: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 720: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 723: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 727: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 729: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 745: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, and Ms. HARMAN.

H. Res. 758: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 759: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CASE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 760: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MACK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SEXTON, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Res. 773: Mr. KIRK, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 784: Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. DELAURO.